









THE BRITISH  
  
QUARTERLY REVIEW

JULY AND OCTOBER,

1858.

VOL. XXVIII.

LONDON:  
ACKSON & WALFORD, 18, ST. PAUL'S CHURCHYARD;  
AND  
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL AND CO., STATIONERS' HALL COURT.  
EDINBURGH: W. OLIPHANT AND SONS.  
GLASGOW: J. MACLEHOSE.—DUBLIN: J. ROBERTSON.



. LONDON:  
SAVILL AND EDWARDS, PRINTERS, CHANDOS STREET,  
COVENT GARDEN.

# CONTENTS OF N° LVI



## ART.

- I. The History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By J. A. FROUDE, M.A. Vols. III., IV. 1858. . . . . 265
- II. Vetus et Novum Testamentum, ex antiquissimo Codice Vaticano. Edidit ANGELUS MAIUS, S.R.E. Card. Romæ. 1857. 5 vols. 4to. . . . . 315
- III. 1. Histoire des Livres Populaires, et de la Littérature du Colportage, depuis le XV. Siècle jusqu'à 1852. Par M. CHARLES MISARD. 2 tomes. 1854. . . . .
2. A Prognostication of Right Goode Effect. By LEONARD DIGGES. 1555.
3. The Almanacs from 1607 to 1616.
4. Almanacs for the Year 1630.
5. Merlinus Anglicus. By WILLIAM LILLY. 1644 to 1660. . . . . 333
- IV. 1. Fasciculi Zizaniorum Magistri Johannis Wyclif cum Tritico: ascribed to Thomas Netter of Walden, Provincial of the Carmelite Order in England, and Confessor to King Henry V. Edited by the Rev. WALTER WADDINGTON SHIRLEY, M.A., Tutor and late Fellow of Wadham College. 8vo.
2. The Quarterly Review, N<sup>o</sup>. 207. July, 1858.
3. Diatribe in Johannis Wicliffi Reformationis Prodromi, Vitam, Ingenium, Scripta. Auctore S. A. J. DE REUVER GROENMAN. Theol. Doct. Trajecti ad Rhenum apud Rob. Natan. MDCCCLXXXVII.
4. Die theologische Doctrin Johann Wycliffe's. Nach den Quellen dargestellt und Kritisch beleuchtet. Von Dr. ERNST ANTON LEWALD, Kirchenrath und Professor der Theologie zu Heidelberg. ('The Theological Doctrine of John Wycliffe, exhibited from the Original Sources, and critically illustrated.' By Dr. E. A. LEWALD.) In the Quarterly Journal of Historical Theology ('Zeitschrift für die Historische Theologie'); Parts 2 and 4 for 1846, and Part 4 for 1847.
5. Wiclif und die Lollarden. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchengeschichte Englands in den letzten 150 Jahren vor der Reformation. Von GOTTHARD VICTOR LECHLER,

# CONTENTS.

ART.

PAGE

Dr. Phil. • Diakonus in Waiblingen bei Stuttgart. Quarterly Journal of Historical Theology. Parts 3 and 4 for 1853, and Part 2 for 1854.	
6. Johann Wycliffe und seine Bedeutung für die Reformation. Von OSCAR JAEGER, Phil. Dr. Gekrönte Preisschrift. 1844.	
7. Geschichte der Kirchen Reformation in Gross Britanien. Von Dr. GEORG WEBER, Professor und Schul-Direktor in Heidelberg. Neue Ausgabe.	
8. Gerson, Wiclefus, Hussus inter se et cum Reformato-ribus comparati. Auctore J. C. A. WINKELMANN. Commentatio in Certamine Literario Civium Aca-demiæ Georgiæ Augustæ ex sententia Rev. Theol. Ord. die iv. mens. Jun. 1856. Præmio Regio ornata. 1857.	
9. Wiclif, als Vorlaufer der Reformation. Antritts Vorle-sung gehalten zu Leipzig, den 9 Juli, 1858. Von G. " V. ZECHLER, der Phil. u. Theol. Dr., Superint. u. Ordent. Prof. der Theologie. 1858.	
10. Die Vorreformatoren des vierzehnten und funfzehnten Jahrhunderts. Erste Hälfte: Johannes von Wycliffe. Von FRIEDRICH BÖHRINGER.	
11. The Character and Place of Wickliffe as a Reformer. By HERBERT COWELL, of Wadham College. . . . .	360
V. The Catechism of Positive Religion. Translated from the French of Auguste Comte. By RICHARD CON-GREVE, M.A. . . . .	422
VI. 1. The History of Herodotus. A new English Version. Edited, with copious Notes and Appendices, by GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford, assisted by Colonel SIR H. RAWLINSON, K.C.B., and Sir J. G. WILKINSON, F.R.S. Vols. I. and II. 1858.	
2. Herodotus; with a Commentary, by JOSEPH WILLIAMS BLAKESLEY, B.D., late Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. Two Vols. 1854. . . . .	446
VII. 1. Letter to a Noble Lord on the Nature and Prospects of Political Party. By a COMMONER. 1858.	
2. Phases in Politics. By WILLIAM E. LENDRICK. Second Edition. 1858.	
3. Parliamentary Government considered with reference to a Reform of Parliament. By EARL GREY. 1858.	486
EPILOGUE ON AFFAIRS . . . . .	516
EPILOGUE ON BOOKS . . . . .	517

W 340

Original from the Bodleian Library  
Acq. No. 6181 Date 26.2.25

052  
BRIT. LIB.  
Vol. 28  
24.27

# THE BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER , 1858.

ART. I.—*The History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.* By J. A. FROUDE, M.A. Vols. III., IV.  
London: John W. Parker and Son. 1858.

IN the April number of this Journal, we reviewed that part of Mr. Froude's history which contains his account of the social condition of Tudor England, and of the events which were the prelude of our first Reformation. Our review embraced a fragment only of his first and second volumes: his third and fourth have since been given to the public; and, as the portion of his narrative which is now open to our examination comprises the momentous period of 1529—1547, we shall make no apology for criticising it immediately. We have already expressed our judgment on the first half of Mr. Froude's performance—that it has been written under a conception essentially just, that its method is excellent, its research profound, and its style admirable, but that it is deficient in some important particulars, that it abounds in genius and imagination rather than in reason and judgment, and that it has run out into extravagant paradoxes. We shall here only observe that Mr. Froude's second effort corresponds altogether with his previous one: that it has thrown a light upon the events of the era it deals with, which, hitherto, they have never received; that, unlike all antecedent histories of the time, it has risen to the level of its high argument; that, as it comes in contact with the later years of Henry VIII., it carries out logically the ideas under which it proceeded from the first; and that the merits and defects of the entire work are in equally clear prominence throughout it. Speaking generally, however, we are disposed to think that the narrative of the third and fourth volumes of this history is even better than that of the two first; that it is more

flowing, picturesque, and beautiful; but that it is less adorned with profound remarks, and contains fewer passages worthy of quotation. In short, Mr. Froude as he proceeds upon his course, becomes more of an historian and less of a thinker, and grows in sympathy with his subject rather than with his own reflections.

A general view of English history from 1529 to 1547 brings before us the most momentous period of our annals. Amidst a chaos of fleeting, but interesting accidents of regal passion, arrogance, and tyranny, of parliamentary obsequiousness and injustice mingled with wisdom, of Papal intrigue, menace, and duplicity, of European politics alternating between scheming and hostility, and of domestic treasons, convulsions, and conspiracies, that period wrought out essential changes in our polity and social fabric, the effects of which have been immense upon the destinies of England, and to this day are working amongst us. Within that period, not from any popular impulse, but under the guidance of her Sovereign and her Legislature, and with the assent rather than the wishes of the nation, England threw off the outward forms of her ancient faith, and yet retained so much of its spirit, that it revived again for a brief season, that it influenced thoroughly the Reformation, and that it has interpenetrated the Anglican Church system. Within that period, against the will of the Government, and in spite of persecuting laws and proscriptions, the forces of Protestantism made themselves felt among us; and, gathering strength from the contemporaneous movement in Germany, from the fall of the Papal jurisdiction in England, and from the effects of the diffusion of the English Scriptures and Liturgy, so effectually embodied themselves in the national mind, that after a long and restless struggle with the old religious spirit, they either coalesced with the Church of England or issued in Puritanism and Nonconformity. Within that period the power of our Executive Government was so increased by the spoliation of the Church, by the elevation of a courtier noblesse, and in consequence of threats of war abroad and at home, that it approached a despotism in much of its conduct, and enabled a monarch of singular ability to play successfully the part of a dictator, to identify the nation with him in much that was cruel and unjust, to commit a variety of unconstitutional acts, and especially to visit individuals with iniquitous penalties. And throughout this period, so fertile in great events, so important for its constitutional changes, so full of the echoes of a great social and moral revolution, and so rich in interest, that after the lapse of three centuries we feel a peculiar sympathy with it; we see pass before us some of the most important personages who have ever affected the destinies of England—the stern, un-

scrupulous, but most able Henry Tudor; Thomas Cromwell, the great pillar of Erastianism; the gentle, weak, and compromising Cranmer, the type of the Anglican High Church party of to-day; the scheming and thoroughly hardened Gardiner; the not unpleasing form of Reginald Pole, worthy of a better cause; and Latimer, the real champion of English Protestantism. Nor less interesting, if less prominent, are other actors in the drama—the two fair queens who perished on Tower Green; the fierce and ‘manlike’ Margaret of Salisbury; the ambitious Norfolk, and his accomplished son; the pliant and heartless Seymours, the true types of the new aristocracy; the bold and heroic Robert Aske, and a crowd of personages of lesser note, who, mingling in the revolution which was then convulsing England, increase its interest by their successes or their fate.

How Mr. Froude has dealt with the events of this period, we have already stated in general terms. But before we enter upon his narrative, we must warn our readers against two sources of untruth which have overflowed the annals of the time, and have made it very difficult to discern the real nature of its events and personages. Writers who lived during the sixteenth century, either from sympathy, terror, or genuine admiration of the great achievements of which he was the author, overlook the moral quality of many of the acts of Henry VIII. and his ministers, and dazzle our eyes with the portrait of a mighty monarch who overthrew the Papal power in England, who coerced Scotland, and subdued Ireland, who, for years, was the arbiter of European politics, and who had singular skill in making himself popular with his subjects. On the other hand, writers of a later date who are far removed from the stormy crisis of the Reformation, and are unable to appreciate the difficulties of Henry's position, are too prone to confine their attention to the severities which marked his reign, and, coupling them with his undoubted personal faults, to represent him as a monster of cruelty and injustice. The result is that, when viewed under these opposite conceptions, the occurrences of Henry's reign—his acts and his character, appear in lights which thwart each other and the truth; and that the student of the time finds the greatest difficulty in forming a clear opinion upon it. He will perhaps arrive at the soundest conclusions if he steadily refuses to allow success, however great, and national benefits, however magnificent, to blind him to the evidences of moral wickedness; and if again he remembers that in ages of revolution there may be a palliation for acts which could not be excused in better times. We wish we could say that Mr. Froude has followed this method of judgment: on the contrary, he has almost disregarded it; he has frequently lost sight of the

real character of Henry's acts in the contemplation of their consequences; he has a habit of withdrawing his reader's attention from means used to ends gained; and, having filled his mind with contemporary authorities only, he gives us portraits of Henry VIII. and his ministers which we believe to be simply favourable exaggerations. And thus, while he avoids popular errors on this subject, he falls into opposite errors equally important; and deals with the era of Henry VIII. as if he were an enthusiastic iconoclast of 1540, who loses sight of all moral considerations when beholding the downfall of the Papal power in England.

When Henry VIII. called the Parliament of 1529 many causes conspired to promote the Reformation in this country. Undoubtedly the personal quarrel of the king—whatever may be thought of his purpose and motives—was scarcely a fair occasion for a religious schism; and the wrongs of Catherine of Arragon and the indecent relations already established between Henry and Anne Boleyn at once identified a large party in England with the cause of Rome. From the first these scandals united against the Reformation a powerful section of the clergy, a portion of the older nobility, and a formidable minority of the nation. The priests cried out that it was sacrilege to question the Pope's authority, or secretly foresaw their own downfall in any revolution. The Nevilles and the Courtenays liked Queen Catherine personally, remembered the wrongs they had endured from the Tudor dynasty, and very soon began to make the cause of conscience that of rebellion. Nor is it doubtful—however Mr. Froude may gloss over the fact—but that a very numerous party in England repudiated the conduct of Henry in the divorce altogether, and associated the question of ecclesiastical reform with concession to injustice, oppression, and lust. But, although the nature of the 'king's matter' immediately created a Roman opposition, it also gave to Henry and the strength of the nation a principle of common action by means of which the Reformation finally triumphed. The resolution of Henry to get rid of his wife led him on to controvert the Papal power in his realm, and at last to give the signal of its ruin. The desire of some patriotic statesmen to secure a male succession of the crown, and the anxiety of others to secularize church property, concurred to promote that breach with Rome which alone could fulfil their different objects. The general dislike of the people to Wolsey, the growing hostility felt against the priesthood, and the sense of the burden of Papal exactions, turned the mass of the nation in the same direction, and gradually won them on to Protestant sympathies. Nor were the relations of England with the powers of Europe adverse to the movement. For Henry and Francis I. were in close alliance; and

although Charles V. had recently gained the most splendid successes, and was threatening to make the cause of Queen Catherine his own, he was too much embarrassed by the Turks and a rebellious Germany to be really dangerous to the King of England. When, therefore, the Parliament of 1529 met, it was plain that a reform of the ecclesiastical system of England, and possibly a modification of the Papal power, would be popular with the mass of the nation, and would almost necessarily result from the discussion of the divorce. Few, however, could anticipate that the raising of these questions would gradually lead to the overthrow of Catholicism in this country, would incline an orthodox nation to a heresy it abhorred, and would make this Parliament of 1529, every member of which was a sincere Catholic, the parent of our Protestant Reformation.

After the meeting of this important Parliament, the internal history of England reflects the conflict of three parties, each of which had its eminent champions and martyrs, and its herd of unknown and ignoble followers. They may be described as the Roman, the National, and the Protestant parties, each of them clearly defined by a distinct principle, and each resolute to maintain it; and, in consequence of their mutual antagonism, the strong Executive of Henry was enabled to balance their forces, and to direct them each against the other as it suited his purpose. And as together with this self-destructive strife at home there was a corresponding struggle of the powers of Europe which almost neutralized their weight and authority, the policy of Henry was permitted to accomplish itself, and to shape out the early Reformation of this country. We have already alluded to the Roman party, which may be said to have originated in 1527, when the question of the divorce was first considered, but which after 1529 became clearly developed. It was from the first considerable in numbers, in men of note, and in elements of power. It comprised perhaps one-third of the English nation, and especially was strong in the northern counties. It boasted the noble names of Fisher, More, and Warham; and it gathered into itself the mass of the clergy, and a large section of the old aristocracy. And it had all those great but undefinable elements of strength which consist in prescription, antiquity, and time-hallowed associations; in the reverence long due to the head of the Church, and in the strong conservative spirit of England. But its weakness lay in the moral corruption of many of its members, in its own want of self-reliance and self-esteem, and in the unpopularity it derived from its allegiance to the Pope. As yet, however, it displayed an imposing appearance; strong in the Privy Council and the House of Lords; not without representatives in the House of Commons; enthroned in the highest places



of the state and rooted deeply throughout the length and breadth of England ; if full of decay, still bright with outward splendour ; and not yet without much national sympathy with it.

From the Roman, we turn to the National party, which, no doubt, deserves our greatest attention, as it was dominant from 1529 to the time of Mary Tudor, and became the instrument of our first Reformation. It was headed by the king and the body of the nobility, it was especially powerful in the House of Commons and the midland and southern counties ; and gradually it assimilated to itself a large proportion of the Roman faction. From a variety of motives it had resolved to promote the divorce, to modify and reduce the authority of the Pope in England, to secularize a part of the property of the Church, and to establish ecclesiastical independence in this country. But it was not less opposed than the Roman party to the Protestant heresy, and insisted upon the observance of all the Catholic doctrines. In fact it was that party of moderate progress, which hitherto in all the revolutions of England, has fortunately been the most powerful ; it was averse to speculative changes, but anxious for practical reform ; and, although under the oppressive influence of Henry VIII. it identified itself with much that was cruel and unjust, and the Erastian Anglo-Catholicism, which was its product, was, perhaps, the most offensive of ecclesiastical systems, it was unquestionably the author of great good, and promoted the real welfare of the country. Among the laity its most prominent figure is that of Cromwell—the destroyer of monasticism in England—and amongst the clergy, though each very different from the other, Gardiner and Cranmer.\*

There yet remains the Protestant party, as yet of no account in the state, the objects of the hate of Romanists and Anglo-Catholics, the martyrs alike of More and Gardiner, but soon to rise to the greatest importance and destined to revolutionize England. Mr. Froude's account of this party is singularly interesting :—

‘ Unlike the first reformers who had followed Wicliffe, they had no earthly object, emphatically none ; and equally unlike them, perhaps, because they had no earthly object—they were all as I have said poor men—either students like Tyndal, or artizans and labourers who worked for their own bread, and in tough contact with society had learnt better than the great and the educated the difference between truth and lies. Wicliffe had royal dukes and noblemen for his supporters—knights and divines among his disciples—a king and a House of Commons looking upon him, not without favour. The first Protestants of the sixteenth century had for their king the champion

\* Of course, our readers will recollect that Cranmer, at a later period, became more Protestant.

of Holy Church, who had broken a lance with Luther; and a spiritual authority over them alike powerful and imbecile whose highest conception of Christian virtue was the destruction of those who disobeyed it. The masses of the people were indifferent to a cause which promised them no material advantage; and the Commons of Parliament, while contending with the abuses of the spiritual authorities, were laboriously anxious to wash their hands of heterodoxy. 'In the crime of heresy, thanks be to God,' said the bishops in 1529, 'there hath no notable person fallen in our time'—no chief priest, chief ruler, or learned Pharisee—not one. 'Truth it is that certain apostate friars and monks, lewd priests, bankrupt merchants, vagabonds, and lewd idle fellows of corrupt nature have embraced the abominable and erroneous opinions lately sprung in Germany, and by them have been some seduced in simplicity and ignorance. Against these, if judgment have been exercised according to the laws of the realm, we be without blame. If we have been too remiss or slack, we shall gladly do our duty from henceforth.' Such were the first Protestants in the eyes of their superiors. On one side was wealth, rank, dignity, the weight of authority, the majority of numbers, the prestige of centuries; here too were the phantom legions of superstition and cowardice; and here were all the worthier influences so pre-eminently English, which lead wise men to shrink from change, and to cling to things established, so long as one stone of them remains upon another. This was the army of conservatism. Opposed to it was a little band of enthusiasts, armed only with truth and fearlessness, 'weak things of the world,' about to do battle in God's name, and it was to be seen whether God or the world was the stronger. They were armed, I say, with the truth. It was that alone which could have gained them victory in so unequal a struggle. They had returned to the essential fountain of life: they reasserted the principle which has lain at the root of all religions, whatever their name or outward form, which once burnt with divine lustre in that Catholicism which was now to pass away; the fundamental axiom of all real life, that the service which man owes to God is not the service of words, or magic forms, or ceremonies, or opinions; but the service of holiness, of purity, of obedience to the everlasting laws of duty.'

Such were the three great parties into which England was divided. At present the National party was on the ascendant, and, supported by Henry and the majority of the House of Commons, was resolved to promote the divorce, and the reform of the Church. A separation from Rome was not yet in contemplation; but the jurisdiction of the Pope in England had become most unpopular; and already events were portending an ecclesiastical revolution. The first burst of the storm broke upon Wolsey, who was justly considered the main support of the old state of things, and whose fall, it was expected, would hasten the crisis. The great minister was quickly made to experience how elevated rank in an age of revolution, and commanding genius in

advance of its own generation, and in contact with base and envious natures, are too frequently fatal advantages; and how with kings, as with the mass of mankind, the sense of bygone obligations is slight, when compared with that of present interest. Wolsey's exercise of the legatine power in England—although supported by many precedents, and especially sanctioned by Henry VIII.—his reformation of the ordinary ecclesiastical courts, and his visitation and suppression of some of the lesser monasteries, had made him liable to the penalties of the old Statutes of Provisors; and his policy as regards the French alliance, his lofty position as sole minister, his somewhat haughty and unbending demeanour, his undoubted yielding to one of the abuses of the time, the engrossing of several offices in Church and State, and various rumours against his personal morality, had exposed him to a great deal of unpopularity. He was shamefully abandoned by Henry to his fate; pleaded guilty to a series of charges of different kinds, which, undoubtedly brought him within the letter of the Statutes of Provisors, but had either been condoned by the king himself, or were altogether obsolete and frivolous; and was most unjustly deprived of all his possessions. Very shortly afterwards a charge of treason was made against him, and he was probably saved by death only from its consequences; but though the malice of his numerous enemies failed to reach its object, and the royal ingratitude which 'had given over his grey hairs' to shame, did not commit them to the executioner, with Wolsey passed away the former era, and Rome had never again so judicious a champion in England. The cause of the Reformation was already half won, when that sagacious brain and clear intelligence gave their last touching utterances to the monks of Leicester Abbey; and left the new forces which were agitating the country without a power to control or direct them.

• The punishment of Wolsey was within the law, but the extension of it to all the clergy of England by perverting the meaning of the Statutes of Provisors deserves the greatest reprobation. For the clergy had opposed the reforms of Wolsey as far as was in their power; and, therefore, the laying them under the penalties of a premunire as 'the fautors, maintainers, and receivers' of the cardinal was simply an act of gross iniquity. We need scarcely notice Mr. Froude's attempt to excuse this wrong, upon the plea that the general misconduct of the clergy could justify the enacting a special law against them, and visiting them with an enormous fine, for in truth this act of unjust extortion was not so much a governmental censure, as a specimen of that arbitrary rapacity which so often defaced the reign of Henry VIII. But

in 1529–30–31, the will of the sovereign and the tide of national feeling were so strong against the Church, that it is almost surprising that the revolutionary current was not more destructive. And in truth—although we have given our reasons for believing Mr. Froude's account of it very exaggerated—the status of the Church in England at this period was quite incompatible with good government, was peculiarly oppressive towards the mass of the people, and required a large and immediate reform. The Houses of Convocation, in defiance of the common law, had succeeded in legislating independently of the Crown, and had overlaid the frame of society with a network of canon law, which embarrassed it painfully at every turn of life, and yet was a mere device of clerical extortion. The higher ecclesiastical offices were frequently held by foreigners and aliens, who were only known as absentee and extortioners; and the absorption of the first year's income of every bishoprick by the Pope, whenever the see became vacant, was a premium to the appointment of men made worthless by old age. The sympathy of the people with the regular clergy had greatly declined, for the spirit which once had animated the monastic orders had given place to luxury, covetousness, and selfishness; and the stately temples in which mediæval piety had enshrined them were, in many instances, considered abodes of corruption and un-English feeling. And, as usually happens, the pretensions of the ecclesiastics did not decline as they sank in the national estimation; they continued, for the most part, blind to the signs of the times; instead of reforming themselves they remained entrenched within their privileges, isolated in perilous splendour, and cut off from the people; and they went on punishing, or teasing heretics, putting in force all their ghostly machinery of exaction and self-aggrandizement, and gathering upon themselves every kind of obloquy and dislike, in perfect unconsciousness of the coming revolution.

As a specimen of one of the abuses of the Church, which was so soon to disappear in England, we transcribe Mr. Froude's picturesque account of the ecclesiastical courts of this period:—

‘In order that we may see distinctly what London felt on this occasion, that we may understand in detail the nature of the questions with which Parliament was immediately to deal, we will glance at some of the proceedings which had taken place in the Bishop's Consistory Courts during the few preceding years. The duties of the officials of these courts resembled in theory the duties of the censors under the Roman Republic. In the middle ages a lofty effort had been made to overpass the common limitations of government, to introduce punishment for sins as well as crimes, and to visit with temporal penalties the breach of the moral law. The punishment best adapted for such

offences was some outward expression of the disapproval with which good men regard acts of sin; some open disgrace; some spiritual censure; some suspension of communion with the Church, accompanied by other consequences practically inconvenient, to be continued until the offender had made reparation, or had openly repented, or had given confirmed proof of amendment. The administration of such a discipline fell, as a matter of course, to the clergy. The clergy were the guardians of morality; their characters were a claim to confidence; their duties gave them opportunities of observation which no other men could possess; while their priestly office gave solemn weight to their sentences. Thus arose throughout Europe a system of spiritual surveillance over the habits and conduct of every man, extending from the cottage to the castle, taking note of all wrong dealing, of all oppression of man by man, of all licentiousness and profligacy, and representing upon earth, in the principles by which it was guided, the laws of the great tribunal of Almighty God.

Such was the origin of the Church Courts, perhaps the greatest institutions ever yet devised by man. But to aim at these high ideals is as perilous as it is noble; and weapons which may be safely trusted in the hands of saints become fatal implements of mischief when saints have ceased to wield them. For a time, we need not doubt, the practice corresponded to the intention. Had it not been so, the conception would have taken no root, and would have been extinguished at its birth. But a system which has once established itself in the respect of mankind will be tolerated long after it has forfeited its claim to endurance, as the name of a great man remains honoured, though borne by worthless descendants; and the Consistory Courts had continued into the sixteenth century with unrestricted jurisdiction, although they had been for generations merely perennially flowing fountains, feeding the ecclesiastical exchequer. The moral conduct of every English subject remained subject to them. Each private person was liable to be called in question for every action of his life; and an elaborate network of canon law, perpetually growing, enveloped the whole surface of society. But between the original design and the degenerate counterfeit there was this vital difference, that the censures were no longer spiritual. They were commuted in various gradations for pecuniary fines, and each offence against morality was rated at its specific money value in the episcopal tables. Suspension and excommunication remained as ultimate penalties; but they were resorted to only to compel unwilling culprits to accept the other alternative.

The misdemeanours of which the courts took cognizance were 'offences against chastity,' 'heresy,' or 'matter sounding thereunto,' 'witchcraft,' 'drunkenness,' 'scandal,' 'defamation,' 'impatient words,' 'broken promises,' 'untruth,' 'absence from church,' 'speaking evil of saints,' 'nonpayment of offerings,' and other delinquencies incapable of legal definition; matters, all of them, on which it was well, if possible, to keep men from going wrong, but offering wide opportunities for injustice; while all charges, whether well founded or ill, met with ready acceptance in courts where innocence and guilt alike contributed to the

revenue. 'Mortuary claims' were another fertile matter for prosecution; and probate duties, and legacy duties; and a further lucrative occupation was the punishment of persons who complained against the constitutions of the courts themselves; to complain against the justice of the courts being to complain against the Church, and to complain against the Church being heresy. To answer accusations on such subjects as these, men were liable to be summoned at the will of the officials, to the metropolitan courts of the archbishops, hundreds of miles from their homes. No expenses were allowed; and if the charges were without foundation it was rare that costs could be recovered. Innocent or guilty, the accused parties were equally bound to appear. If they failed, they were suspended for contempt. If after receiving notice of their suspension they did not appear, they were excommunicated; and no proof of the groundlessness of the original charge availed to relieve them from their sentence till they had paid for their deliverance.

'Well did the Church lawyers understand how to make their work productive. Excommunication seems but a light thing when there are many communions. It was no light thing when it was equivalent to outlawry; when the person excommunicated might be seized and imprisoned at the will of the ordinary; when he was cut off from all holy offices; when no one might speak to him, trade with him, or show him the most trivial courtesy; and when his friends, if they dared to assist him, were subject to the same penalties. In the register of the Bishop of London there is more than one instance to be found of suspension and excommunication for the simple crime of offering shelter to an excommunicated neighbour; and thus offence begot offence, guilt spread like a contagion through the influence of natural humanity, and a single refusal of obedience to a frivolous citation might involve entire families in misery and ruin.'

Such, then, was the Church of alien sympathies, of imposing splendour, of tyrannous institutions, and of far-spreading oppressiveness, against which the king and the National party of England now directed their energies. The object of Henry appears at first to have been only to threaten—to warn the Pope that his jurisdiction in England might be summarily curtailed, and that its maintenance depended chiefly on his compliance in the matter of the divorce. But that of the National party, which now was predominant in the House of Commons, was to abridge thoroughly ecclesiastical privileges, to reform the many corruptions of the Church, and to weaken, at least, its connexion with Rome. This object is made evident in the famous Petition of the Commons, in 1530, against the bishops—a document which Mr. Froude very properly gives us completely, and which may be described as the National Bill of Indictment against the Clergy. This very remarkable state paper deserves attention, both for what it says and what it omits. It is almost silent upon

the subject of the gross profligacy of the ecclesiastics which Mr. Froude imputes so generally to them, a silence which makes us somewhat sceptical as regards this allegation; and, while it condemns as unjust the episcopal method of dealing with heretics, it records an emphatic protest against 'the new fantastical opinions' becoming prevalent in Germany. But it lays bare, and as Mr. Froude observes, with masterly clearness, a whole mass of clerical abuses of a political and social character, the irregular legislation of the Houses of Convocation, the conduct of the officials of the Ecclesiastical Courts, the exorbitant fees taken by them, and the simony prevalent throughout the Church; and it demands a remedy for these abuses in a tone not to be mistaken. The reply of the champions of the clergy is not less remarkable, for it reveals their utter unconscientiousness of their position, and their tacit assent to the charges made against them. It attempts to justify the legislative encroachments of Convocation at a time when it was about to lose its independence, and to become the mere appendage of Erastianism, in language which might have been used by Becket or Hildebrand; and, as regards the residue of the accusations, it only shifts their burden from the order in general upon individuals in it. In this state of things we can only be surprised that the National party was so moderate, and that some excellent laws against excessive probate duties, against mortuary claims, and clerical non-residence, should have been the only immediate results of the great petition.

But the march of events was not to be arrested, and, though slowly, the great revolution was to work itself out. Henry appears from the first to have given up the bishops of 1530; he never treated one of them afterwards with respect; and his subsequent appointments to sees were of men of a different nature altogether. And as his attitude towards Rome became more menacing, and his impatience for the divorce more urgent, the zeal of the National party against the Church was quickened in intensity. From the middle of the year 1530 the king and this party were completely identified in action. After an idle appeal from the former to the Pope and Charles V., in which the father of Anne Boleyn insultingly figured as plenipotentiary, and which only showed the king's resolution to free himself from his queen, he had sought the opinion of the universities of Europe upon the question at issue, and had procured from the House of Lords a remonstrance to Clement in his favour. We may estimate, however, the real value of these semblances of fair conduct, and can form a just notion of Henry's real purpose, when we bear in mind that, even as Mr. Froude admits, every kind of bribery and intimidation was brought to bear upon the universities, in order

to obtain a favourable decision, and that, after the year 1530, Anne Boleyn was openly treated as the expectant consort of the king, and was actually domiciled as such within his palace. Such a palpable disregard of the Pope's authority was not to be mistaken; and, accordingly, from this moment the progress of the Reformation was accelerated, and the efforts of the National party became more vehement. A series of statutes abridging the benefit of clergy, reforming thoroughly the ecclesiastical courts, reducing the power of alienating lands in mortmain, annexing to the Crown the annats or first fruits of sees, and, above all, depriving emphatically the Houses of Convocation of the means of independent legislation, attest the gradual triumphs of the anti-Roman policy. And it is to be observed, that from this date a strong Erastian party grew up among the clergy, and that, although the larger, and we will add, the nobler part of them adhered to their old allegiance, and openly opposed the changes going on, a powerful minority of them became converts to the Anglo-Catholicism which began to be esteemed as the state religion.

Mr. Froude thus describes the state of opinion in England at this crisis, when the National party was quite in the ascendant, when that of Rome was not yet altogether defined, and when the clergy were separating themselves into an alliance with either faction. The description is splendid, though somewhat over-coloured:—

‘The air was impregnated with superstition; in a half consciousness of the impending changes all men were listening with wide ears to rumours and prophecies, and fantastic foreshadowings of the future; and fanaticism half deceiving, and half itself deceived, was grasping the lever of the popular excitement to work out its own ends. The power which had ruled the hearts of mankind for ten centuries was shaking suddenly to its foundation. The infallible guidance of the Church was failing; its light gone out, or pronounced to be but a mere deceitful *ignis futurus*; and men found themselves wandering in darkness, unknowing where to turn, or what to think or believe. It was easy to clamour against the spiritual courts. From men smarting under the immediate grievances of that iniquitous jurisdiction, the immediate outcry rose without ulterior thought; but unexpectedly the frail edifice of the Church itself threatened under the attack to crumble into ruins; and many gentle hearts began to tremble and recoil when they saw what was likely to follow on their light beginnings. It was true that the measures as yet taken by the parliament and the crown professed to be directed not to the overthrow of the Church, but to the re-establishment of its strength. But the exulting triumph of the Protestants, the promotion of Latimer to a royal chaplaincy, the quarrel with the Papacy, and a dim but sure perception of the direction in which the



stream was flowing, foretold to earnest Catholics a widely different issue; and the simplest of them knew better than the court knew that they were drifting from the sure moorings of the faith into the broad ocean of uncertainty. There seems, indeed, to be in religious men, whatever be their creed, and however limited their intellectual power, a prophetic faculty of insight into the true bearings of outward things—an insight which puts to shame the sagacity of statesmen, and claims for the sons of God, and only for them, the wisdom even of the world. Those only read the world's future truly who have faith in principle, as opposed to faith in human dexterity; who feel that in human things there lies really and truly a spiritual nature, a spiritual connexion, a spiritual tendency, which the wisdom of the serpent cannot alter, and scarcely can affect.

Excitement, however, is no guarantee for the understanding; and these instincts, powerful as they are, may be found often in minds wild and chaotic, which, although they vaguely foresee the future, yet have no power of sound judgment, and know not what they foresee, or how wisely to estimate it. Their wisdom, if we may so use the word, combines crudely with any form of superstition or fanaticism. Thus in England, at the time of which we are speaking, Catholics and Protestants had alike their horoscope of the impending changes, each nearer to the truth than the methodical calculations of the statesman; yet their foresight did not affect their convictions, or alter the temper of their hearts. They foresaw the same catastrophe, yet their faith still coloured the character of it. To the one it was the advent of Anti-Christ, to the other the inauguration of the millennium. The truest-hearted men on all sides were deserted by their understandings at the moment when their understandings were the most deeply needed: and they saw the realities which were round them transfigured into phantoms through the mists of their hopes and fears. The present was significant only as it seemed in labour with some gigantic issue, and the events of the outer world flew from lip to lip, taking, as they passed, every shape most wild and fantastical. Until the 'king's matter' was decided there was no censorship upon speech, and all tongues ran freely on the great subjects of the day. Every parish pulpit rang with the divorce, or with the perils of the Catholic faith; at every village ale-house, the talk was of St. Peter's keys, the sacrament, or of the Pope's supremacy, or of the points in which a priest differed from a layman. Ostlers quarrelled over such questions as they groomed their master's horses; old women mourned across the village shopboards of the evil days which were come or coming; while every kind of strangest superstition, fairy stories, and witch stories, stories of saints and stories of devils, were woven in and out and to and fro, like quaint, bewildering arabesques, in the tissue of the general imagination.

In this state of things the current of revolution was accelerated by the conduct of Henry VIII., which widened the breach between the nation and the Roman party, gave rebellion in England a moral aspect and a principle of cohesion, and furnished the

*The King abandons Catherine and marries Anne Boleyn.* 279

Popé and the Emperor with an excuse for intervention. From the autumn of 1529, at least, Anne Boleyn had been domesticated in the king's palace, and had been surrounded with the state of a princess; but as yet Catherine and Henry had not formally separated, and her rival had not been placed in the rank of an actual wife. But in June, 1531, the ill-fated queen was finally abandoned; and in November, 1532, Anne Boleyn was married to Henry, under circumstances of peculiar discredit. For these acts there is no excuse whatever; for they are characterized with effrontery, cruelty, and indecency. The king had always admitted that some legal sanction was necessary to justify the divorce, and yet he abandoned Catherine without having ever procured it, although his subsequent conduct proves that he always believed it requisite. He had made the necessity of male issue his chief plea for seeking a new marriage; and yet he threw the suspicion of illegitimacy over his issue by Anne Boleyn by marrying her in private, and before any tribunal had given sentence upon the invalidity of his first connexion. The consequences of this shameless recklessness were natural. They forced Henry and the National party into excesses of injustice. They drove some of the noblest men in England into the ranks of the Roman party, and gave it a moral strength and dignity which often make us forget it was a party of rebellion. Finally, they placed weapons in the hands of Charles V. and the Papal see, which during the entire reign of Henry VIII. were wielded not without effect, and which, but for unforeseen circumstances, would probably have overwhelmed the Tudor dynasty.

Mr. Froude thus marks out the results of this conduct, and, though somewhat exaggerated, they are substantially correct. But, when stating these results, we must protest against his insinuation that Henry VIII. was not responsible for them, and that he is not to be held accountable before the tribunal of history for the evils which his own criminality originated. Once for all, we must repudiate the notion, which Mr. Froude inculcates sedulously upon his readers, that the difficulties which surrounded Henry VIII. are necessarily a justification of his severities and atrocities; for if, as we believe, those difficulties were chiefly caused by himself, he cannot plead in his own favour the natural consequences of his own wrong. Subject, however, to this remark, the following extract is not unjust:—

'She' (*i. e.* Queen Catherine) 'became the nucleus of a powerful political party. Her injuries had deprived the king and the nation of a right to complain of her conduct. She owed nothing to England. Her allegiance, politically, was to Spain; spiritually, she was the subject of the Pope; and this dubious position gave her an advantage

which she was not slow to perceive. *Rapidly every one rallied to her, who adhered to the old faith, and to whom the measures of the Government appeared a sacrilege. Through herself, or through her secretaries and confessors,* a correspondence was conducted which brought the courts of the continent into connexion with the various disaffected parties in England, with the Nun of Kent and her friars, with the Poles, the Nevilles, the Courtenays, and all the remaining faction of the White Rose. And so first the great party of sedition began to shape itself, which, for sixty years, except in the short-lived interlude of its triumph under Catherine's daughter, held the nation on the edge of civil war. We shall see this faction slowly and steadily organizing itself, starting from scattered and small beginnings, till at length it overspread all England, and Ireland, and Scotland, exploding from time to time in abortive insurrections, yet ever held in check by the tact and firmness of the Government, and by the inherent loyalty of the English to the land of their birth. There was a proverb then current that 'the treasons of England' should never cease. It was perhaps fortunate that the Papal cause was the cause of a foreign power, and could only be defended by a betrayal of the independence of the country. In Scotland and Ireland the insurrectionists were more successful, being supported in either instance by the national feeling. But the strength of Scotland had been broken at Flodden; and Ireland, though hating the Saxons with her whole heart, was far off and divided. The true danger was at home; and when the extent and nature of it is fairly known and weighed, we shall understand better what is called 'the tyranny' of Henry VIII. and of Elizabeth; and rather admire the judgment than condemn the resolution which steered the country safe among those dangerous shoals. Elizabeth's position is more familiar to us, and is more reasonably appreciated because the danger was more palpable. Henry has been hardly judged because he trampled down the smouldering fire, and never allowed it to assume the form which would have justified him with the foolish and the unthinking. Once, and once only, the flame blazed out; but it was checked on the instant, and therefore it has been slighted and forgotten. But with despatches before his eyes, in which Charles V. was offering James of Scotland the hand of the Princess Mary, with the title for himself of Prince of England and Duke of York—with Ireland, as we shall speedily see it, in flame from end to end, and Dublin Castle the one spot left within the island on which the banner of St. George still floated—with a corps of friars in hair shirts and chains, who are also soon to be introduced to us, and an inspired prophetess at their head, preaching rebellion in the name of God—with his daughter, and his daughter's mother in league against him, some forty thousand clergy, to be coerced into honest dealing, and the succession to the Crown floating in uncertainty—finally, with excommunication hanging over himself, and at length falling, and his deposition pronounced, Henry, we may be sure, had no easy time of it, and no common work to accomplish; and all these things ought to be present before our minds, as they were before

his mind, if we would see him as he was, and judge him as we would be judged ourselves.'

The repudiation of Catherine, and the marriage of Anne Boleyn brought affairs both in England and on the Continent to a crisis, and by placing Henry in a false position, ultimately led to the isolation from the powers of Europe in which he usually found himself during the later years of his reign, and involved him in dangers and troubles at home. To sustain these acts the National party in England passed the Statute of Appeals, a measure of unquestionable general benefit, but which, by a clause of retrospective injustice, deprived Queen Catherine of her right to have her cause determined by the Pope. Convocation was now made her only arbiter; and after a trial, at which the queen refused to plead, and which was the merest judicial mockery, Cranmer pronounced a sentence of divorce against her, which Dr. Lingard very properly terms a farce, and with which it is evident that the king himself was not satisfied. This 'Dunstable divorce,' as it was termed, created an immense sensation throughout Europe. It roused, to bitter indignation the temper of Charles V., and led him to excite Ireland to insurrection, and Scotland to war. It fairly exasperated Clement VII., and caused him to plan a Catholic league against England to carry out by force the censures of the Vatican. It seems to have somewhat disgusted Francis I.; for, from this time, his personal friendship for Henry appears to have lessened, and soon afterwards he permitted himself to incline towards the Pope. But its principal mischief was felt at home. It was this which gave a semblance of justice to the cause of the Roman party; which made the ravings of the Nun of Kent obtain a wide credit; and which enabled hundreds of priests and of monks, in their sermons and discourses, to associate the cause of the Reformation with that of baseness and illegality. Nor should it be forgotten that it was the Dunstable divorce which was one of the chief causes of the alienation of England from Germany in a movement common to both; and which, notwithstanding the genius of Cromwell, has for ever separated two great branches of the Teutonic family as regards the Reformation. But for this, as Mr. Froude most truly remarks, it is probable that Protestantism throughout Europe would have been more united, and would have had a deeper influence than it actually has at this instant.

We have no space to insert Mr. Froude's description of the coronation of Anne Boleyn, which though largely borrowed from Hull, is very beautiful, and may rival any of Lord Macaulay's.

historical pictures. But the following passage is so perfect, that we cannot resist the pleasure of transcribing it:—

‘In an open space behind the constable there was seen approaching a ‘white chariot,’ led by two palfreys in white damask, which swept the ground, a golden canopy borne above it making music with silver bells. And in the chariot sat the observed of all observers, the beautiful occasion of all this glittering homage; fortune’s plaything of the hour, the Queen of England—queen at last—borne along upon the waves of this sea of glory, breathing the perfumed incense of greatness, which she had risked her fair name, her delicacy, her honour, her self-respect to win; and she had won it.

‘There she sat, dressed in white tissue robes, her fair hair flowing loose over her shoulders, and her temples circled with a light coronet of gold and diamonds—most beautiful—loveliest—most favoured, perhaps, as she seemed at that hour, of all England’s daughters. Alas! ‘within the hollow round’ of that coronet—

‘Kept Death his court, and there the antick sate,  
 Scoffing her state and grinning at her pomp,  
 Allowing her a little breath, a little scene  
 To monarchize, be feared, and kill with looks,  
 Infusing her with self and vain conceit,  
 As if the flesh which walled about her life  
 Were brass impregnable; and humoured thus,  
 Bored through her castle walls; and farewell, Queen.’

‘Fatal gift of greatness! so dangerous ever! so more than dangerous in those tremendous times when the fountains are broken loose of the great deeps of thought; and nations are in the throes of revolution;—when ancient order, and law, and tradition are splitting in the social earthquake; and, as the opposing forces wrestle to and fro, those unhappy ones who stand out above the crowd become the symbols of the struggle, and fall the victims of its alternating fortunes. And what if into an unsteady heart and brain, intoxicated with splendour, the outward chaos should find its way, converting the poor silly soul into an image of the same confusion,—if conscience should be deposed from her high place, and the Pandora box be broken loose of passions, and sensualities, and follies; and at length there be nothing left of all which man or woman ought to value, save hope of God’s forgiveness.’

The king and the National party were now thoroughly united, and were resolved to overbear all opposition, and to complete the revolution towards Anglo-Catholicism. At the head of this party was Thomas Cromwell, who now, for several years, becomes the most prominent figure among Englishmen, and to whom the peculiar polity of the Church of England is chiefly to be ascribed. The policy of this remarkable man was very simple—it was a systematic and unscrupulous hostility to the Roman party in England, a statesmanlike antipathy to the Papal jurisdiction, and

a resolution to re-establish a National Church completely under the dominion of the crown. To gain these ends he crushed the Roman party altogether; he caused the destruction of monasticism among us; he kept England in a state of isolation from the Catholic Powers; and, though speculatively not a Protestant, he ever courted for her a German alliance. Mr. Froude thus sums up his character for us, and does no more than justice to his energetic ability:—

‘The nation in the ferment of revolution was absolutely controlled by him; and he has left the print of his individual genius stamped indelibly, while the metal was at white heat, into the constitution of the country. Wave after wave has rolled over his work. Romanism flowed back over it under Mary. Puritanism, under another even grander Cromwell, overwhelmed it. But Romanism ebbed again, and Puritanism is dead, and the polity of the Church of England remains as it was left by its creator.

‘And not in the Church only, but in all departments of the public service, Cromwell was the sovereign guide. In the Foreign Office, and the Home Office, in Star Chamber and at council table, in dockyard and law court, Cromwell’s intellect presided, Cromwell’s hand executed. His gigantic correspondence remains to witness for his varied energy. Whether it was an ambassador or a commissioner of sewers, a warden of a company or a tradesman who was injured by the guild, a bishop or a heretic, a justice of the peace, or a serf crying for emancipation, Cromwell was the universal authority to whom all officials looked for instruction, and all sufferers looked for redress.’

When, in 1534, Cromwell rose to the head of affairs, the cause of the Reformation was beset with many dangers, although it had the support of the king and the National party. Henry was thoroughly ashamed of the Dunstable divorce, and, although he had refused to accept the Pope’s judgment upon it, he had offered to refer the question to a general council. This distrust of his own conduct was eagerly watched; and at one time, just before his final break with Rome, the Pope appears to have expected a reconciliation with him. The Emperor was only waiting an opportunity for vengeance; he had already excited an insurrection in Ireland, and had attempted to gain over James V. of Scotland to his side; and in 1534 he appears to have actually meditated an invasion of this country. Francis I. was no longer in cordial alliance with England; he had been won over by Papal intrigue to a neutral policy; and the marriage of Clement’s niece, the celebrated Catherine de Medici, with the Duke of Orleans, and the aversion of the people of France to the Reformation, had weakened the ties that so recently had united the two sovereigns. But the principal danger of a counter-revolution was

at home. There was as yet no restriction upon speech or writing; and hundreds of pulpits throughout England rung every week with denunciations of the king and of the policy he was following. The fanatical ravings of the Nun of Kent, in the excitement of the national mind, acquired an extraordinary significance; and, as they were uttered at the bidding of the priesthood, by whom she was represented as inspired, they all took the shape of prophecies against the Reformation. Already, too, the Roman party was meditating insurrection; there had been symptoms of serious disaffection in the northern counties; and it seemed probable that before long the cause of Queen Catherine might plunge the nation in civil war. As Mr. Froude observes, even on the verge of the final severance, there were not wanting signs of a great reaction, and, even at the last moment, it seemed possible that the stone which it had required so much trouble to roll to the top of the hill might fall backward to its old resting-place.

But the events of the next two years prevented this catastrophe; and Cromwell and the National party went on in their work. In 1534, apparently with great reluctance, and after a protracted game of shift and evasion, the Pope gave sentence against Henry in the matter of the divorce. The die was now cast; the issue between Rome and England was finally raised; and, for the present, all hope of reconciliation was at an end. To avert the consequences of the threatened Catholic alliance against him Henry tried to associate himself with the German Protestants; but the projected league proved unsuccessful. He extinguished the insurrection in Ireland, which Charles V. had secretly fomented, and, although his treatment of the Geraldines on this occasion is quite indefensible, we must admire the boldness and vigour of his policy. For the present the war with Scotland did not break out; and although in 1534 there were many rumours of a Spanish invasion of England, the peril passed away, and Henry found himself at leisure to control the shock of factions at home. From this moment the conduct of the king and the National party becomes marked with much atrocity and injustice. A series of tremendous statutes and measures, abolishing the Pope's supremacy, confirming that of the king, and annexing the penalties of high treason to their infringement, attest the vigour of the Erastian movement which was now in progress. These laws, as Dr. Lingard remarks, stamped a new character upon the criminal code of the country; although the circumstances which occasioned them may partly excuse them, they reflect discredit upon the Reformation; and cruel as were the laws themselves, the method of their administration was still more atrocious. It was held that sus-

pected persons might be arrested and examined touching the king's supremacy, or his marriage with Anne Boleyn, and that if their answers were not satisfactory, they had made themselves liable for an act of high treason—a doctrine obviously subversive of all justice. And quite in conformity with these iniquities, a cloud of spies and informers began to overspread the country, who, sedulously protected and encouraged by Cromwell, enabled him to exercise an enormous despotism over every individual in the kingdom. It is not too much to say that the inauguration of Erastianism in England was attended with so many evils, with such unjust legislation, such stretches of arbitrary power, and such perils to our liberties, that at first sight, the historical student recoils from it in disgust, and feels a sympathy for the system it supplanted.

When the administration of Henry was armed with such tremendous powers, it was not difficult to bring the Roman party in England within their grasp. The Nun of Kent and her chief accomplices were convicted of high treason, and, after a short delay, were sent to the executioner. The spies of Cromwell brought to light a White Rose conspiracy, in which the Neville family was said to be implicated. A stricter surveillance was placed upon Queen Catherine; and the Princess Mary was rigorously watched. But it was against the clergy that the principal efforts of the Government were directed. They were known to be really well affected to the Pope; and it was resolved to control them as far as possible. Mr. Froude gives this account of them at this crisis:—

‘The Government knew too well the temper of the clergy to trust to outward compliance, or to feel assured that they acquiesced at heart either in the separation from Rome or in the loss of their treasured privileges. The theory of an Anglican Erastianism found favour with some of the higher church dignitaries, and with a section perhaps of the secular priests, but the transfer to the Crown of the first fruits, which, in their first zeal for a free Church of England, the ecclesiastics had hoped to preserve for themselves, the abrupt limitation of the powers of convocation, and the termination of so many time-honoured and lucrative abuses, had interfered with the popularity of a view which might have been otherwise broadly welcomed; and while growing vigorously among the country gentlemen and the middle classes in the towns, among the clergy it throve only within the sunshine of the court. The rest were overawed for the moment, and stunned by the suddenness of the blows which had fallen upon them. As far as they thought at all, they believed that the storm would be but of brief duration, that it would pass away as it had risen, and that for the moment they had only to bend. The modern Englishman looks back upon the time with the light of after history. He has been



inured by three centuries of division to the spectacle of a divided Church, and sees nothing in it either embarrassing or fearful. The ministers of a faith which had been for fifteen centuries as the seamless vesture of Christ, the priests of a Church supposed to be founded on the everlasting rock, against which no power could prevail, were in a very different position. They obeyed for the time the strong hand which was upon them, trusting to the interference of accident or providence. They comforted themselves with the hope that the world would speedily fall back into its old ways, that Christ and the saints would defend the Church against sacrilege, and that in the meantime there was no occasion for them to thrust themselves upon voluntary martyrdom. This position, however, natural as it was, became difficult to maintain when they were called upon not only themselves to consent to the changes, but to justify their consent to their congregations, and to explain to the people the grounds on which the Government had acted. The kingdom was by implication under an interdict, yet the services went on as usual; the king was excommunicated; doubt hung over the succession; the facts were imperfectly known; and the never-resting friars mendicant were busy scattering falsehood and misrepresentation. It was of the highest moment that on all these important matters the mind of the nation should if possible be set at rest; and the clergy, whose loyalty was presumed rather than trusted, furnished the only means by which the Government could generally and simultaneously reach the people. The clergy, therefore, as we have seen, were called upon for their services; the Pope's name was erased from the mass books; the statute of appeals, and the statute of succession, were fixed against the doors of every parish church in England, and the rectors and curates were directed every week in their sermons to explain the meaning of these acts. The bishops were held responsible for the obedience of the clergy; the sheriffs and the magistrates had been directed to keep an eye upon the bishops; and all the machinery of centralization was put in force to compel the fulfilment of a duty which was well known to be unwelcome.'

When the clergy had thus been placed in the position of forced advocates of a cause they disliked, and had been rigorously compelled to repudiate the Papal supremacy, there was no difficulty in bringing them within the scope of the measures framed against them. At the same time—as if to dissociate the cause of doctrinal heresy from that of ecclesiastical reform—the Protestants were subjected to persecution, and Anglo-Catholicism could boast its twofold class of victims. Mr. Froude narrates with great beauty and power the destruction of the Carthusian monks, and, contemporaneously with them, of the Anabaptist martyrs; but he has no terms of reprobation for the unsparing cruelty which characterized these actions. The following passage, however, which ushers in these mournful scenes, appears to us very eloquent:

‘Here, therefore, we are to enter upon one of the grand scenes of history; a solemn battle fought out to the death, yet fought without ferocity by the champions of rival principles. Heroic men had fallen, and were still fast falling, for what was called heresy; and now those who had inflicted death on others were called upon to bear the same witness to their own sincerity. England became the theatre of a war between two armies of martyrs, to be waged, not upon the open field in open action, but on the stake and on the scaffold, with the nobler weapons of passive endurance. Each party were ready to give their blood; each party were ready to shed the blood of their antagonists; and the sword was to single out its victims in the rival ranks, not as in peace among those whose crimes made them dangerous to society, but, as on the field of battle, where the most conspicuous courage most challenges the aim of the enemy. It was war, though under the form of peace; and if we would understand the true spirit of the time, we must regard Catholics and Protestants as gallant soldiers, whose deaths, when they fall, are not painful, but glorious; and whose devotion we are equally able to admire, even where we cannot equally approve their cause. Courage and self-sacrifice are beautiful alike in an enemy and in a friend. And while we exult in that Chivalry with which the Smithfield martyrs bought England’s freedom with their blood, so we will not refuse our admiration to those other gallant men whose high forms, in the sunset of the old faith, stand transfigured on the horizon, tinged with the light of its dying glory.’

Such, no doubt, was the attitude in which history views these martyrs; but is history to be silent with regard to the means by which they met their fate? Are we to lose sight, in the contemplation of their deaths, of the remorseless Government by which they were struck down? Here, as elsewhere, Mr. Froude so arranges the lights and shadows of his work as to make us blind to its darkest colours. We must again protest against this forgetfulness of moral considerations in bringing before us the facts of the time.

The persecuting laws which were now in force soon brought Sir Thomas More and Fisher to the scaffold. Even Mr. Froude has scarcely an apology for this twofold murder, although he labours hard to relieve it of its worst colour. But, unfortunately, the trial of Sir Thomas More is tolerably authentic, and such a perversion of justice is quite indefensible. These executions caused the greatest sensation in Europe, and were the occasion of the composition of the famous Bull of Deposition. But the king and the National party still went forward with their work. The year 1536 witnessed the first suppression of the monasteries, and the beginning of that ecclesiastical confiscation which reflects such discredit on the reign of Henry VIII. It is impossible to deny that the evidence against many of these institutions is very strong,

and that probably the continuance of monasticism in England was incompatible with the Reformation; but Mr. Froude's narrative is unjust in this respect, and omits several particulars in favour of some of the religious houses. With this great act of spoliation the Reformation Parliament was dissolved. Its labours had certainly been vast and glorious. It had emancipated England from the Papal jurisdiction, and had laid the foundations of the Reformation. But it had been a compliant instrument of Henry VIII., being full, as Hall says, of the 'kynges friends:' several of its laws had been sanguinary and unjust: it had immensely extended the prerogative of the crown, and it had established in England an Erastianism from which the nation suffered bitterly. Here is Mr. Froude's too partial summary of its achievements:—

'So closed the first great Parliament of the Reformation, which was now dissolved. The Lower House is known to us only as an abstraction. The debates are lost; and the details of its proceedings are visible only in faint transient gleams. We have an epitome of two sessions in the Lords' Journals; but even this partial assistance fails us with the Commons; and the Lords in this matter were a body of secondary moment. The Lords had ceased to be the leaders of the English people; they existed as an ornament rather than a power; and under the direction of the council they followed as the stream drew them, when individually, if they had so dared, they would have chosen a far other course. The work was done by the Commons; by them the first move was made; by them and the king the campaign was carried through to victory. And this one body of men, dim as they now seem to us, who assembled on the wreck of the administration of Wolsey, had commenced and had concluded a revolution which had reversed the foundations of the State. They found England in dependency upon a foreign power; they left it a free nation. They found it under the despotism of a Church establishment saturated with disease; and they had bound the hands of that establishment; they had laid it down under the knife, and carved away its putrid members; and stripping off its Nessus robe of splendour and power, they had awakened in it some forced remembrance of its higher calling. The elements of a deeper change were seething; a change not in the disposition of outward authority, but in the beliefs and convictions which touched the life of the soul. This was yet to come; and the work so far was but the initial step or prelude leading up to the more solemn struggle. Yet where the enemy who is to be conquered is strong, not in vital force, but in the prestige of authority, and in the enchanted defences of superstition, those truly win the battle who strike the first blow, who deprive the idol of its terrors by daring to defy it.'

Contemporaneously with the destruction of the lesser monasteries, the two queens whose destinies have been interwoven with that of the Reformation in England passed away each with a

different fate. The death of Queen Catherine at Kimbolton is chiefly remarkable for the touching letter she addressed to Henry, for the regret he appears to have felt for her, and for the indecent levity displayed at the time by Anne Boleyn. Yet a few months and the reckless jester was to experience the same lot, not attended, as was her rival, with sympathy and respect, but branded with the dark stigma of adultery and incest, and torn away from life by the hand of the executioner. We have no peculiar admiration for Anne Boleyn, and willingly admit that much in her career is reprehensible; but we cannot agree with Mr. Froude that she was probably guilty of the crimes laid to her charge. The only facts that tell against her are the confession of Smeton, and the concurrence in a verdict of guilty of the two tribunals which tried her cause, and undoubtedly these facts give fair ground for argument. But on the other hand, we must remember the extreme improbability that she could have committed the accumulated offences laid to her charge; the resolute denials of Norris, Weston, Brereton, and Lord Rochfort; her own assertions of her innocence; the evident disbelief of Cranmer in her guilt; her apparent consciousness that she had no hope of justice from the king, and the unscrupulous means which it is plain were adopted to procure some plausible proofs against her. We are not disposed to attach much weight to the agreement of two courts of justice against her, for the extreme laxity of the rules of evidence at the Tudor period, the dependence of the judges and the peers upon the Crown, and the unwarrantable nature of every trial of this age, placed almost every state prisoner, without exception, at the mercy of the prosecution. Mr. Froude thus narrates the close of this tragedy:—

‘We are very near the termination of the tragedy. A little before noon on the 19th of May, Anne Boleyn, Queen of England, was led down to the green, where the young grass and the first daisies of summer were freshly bursting in the sunshine. A single cannon stood loaded on the battlements; the motionless cannoneer was ready with smoking linstock at his side; and when the crawling hand upon the dial of the great tower clock touched the midday hour, that cannon would toll to London that all was over. The yeomen of the guard were there, and a crowd of citizens; the lord mayor too, and the deputies of the guilds, and the sheriffs, and the aldermen; they were come to see a spectacle which England had never seen before—a head which had worn the crown falling under the sword of an executioner.

‘On the scaffold, by the king’s desire, there were present Cromwell, the Lord Chancellor, the Duke of Suffolk, and, lastly, the Duke of Richmond, who might now, when both his sisters were illegitimized, be considered heir presumptive to the throne. As in the choice of the commission, as in the conduct of the trial, as in the summons of Parliament, as in every detail through which the cause was passed, Henry had shown but one

desire to do all which the most strict equity prescribed; so around this last scene he had placed those who were nearest in blood to himself, and nearest in rank to the crown. If she who was to suffer was falling under a forged charge, he acted his part with horrible completeness.

'The queen walked firmly to the front of the block. When the few preparations were completed, she turned to the spectators. 'Christian people,' she said, 'I am come to die. And according to law, and by law, I am judged to death; and therefore I will speak nothing against it. I am come hither to accuse no man, nor to speak anything of that whereof I am accused and condemned to die. But I pray God save the king, and send him long to reign over you; for a gentler and more merciful prince was there never; and to me he was ever a good, a gentle, and sovereign lord. If any person will meddle of my cause, I require him to judge the best. And thus I take my leave of the world and of you; and I heartily desire you all to pray for me. Oh Lord, have mercy on me. To God I commend my soul.' 'These words,' says Stowe, 'she spoke with a smiling countenance; which done, she kneeled down on both her knees, and said—'To Jesus Christ I commend my soul;' and with that word the hangman of Calais smote off her head at one stroke with a sword. Her body, with the head, was buried in the quire of the chapel.

'To this end she had come at last, and silence is the best comment which charity has to offer upon it. Better far it would have been if the dust had been allowed to settle down over the grave of Anne Boleyn, and her remembrance buried in forgetfulness. Strange it is that a spot which ought to have been sacred to pity should have been made the arena for the blind wrestling of controversial duellists. Blind I call it; for there has been little clearness of judgment, little even of common prudence, in the choice of sides. If the Catholics could have fastened the stain of murder on the king and the statesmen of England, they would have struck the faith of the Establishment a harder blow, than by a poor tale of scandal against a weak, erring, suffering woman; and the Protestants, in mistaken generosity, have courted an infamy for the names of those to whom they owe their being, which, staining the fountain, must stain for ever the stream which flows from it. It has been no pleasure to me to rake among the evil memories of the past, to prove a human being sinful, whom the world has ruled to have been innocent. Let the blame rest with those who have forced upon our history the alternative of a reassertion of the truth, or the shame of noble names which have not deserved it at our hands.'

We have only to add as a sequel to this tragedy, that Henry dressed himself in white the day of his wife's execution, that almost immediately afterwards he married Jane Seymour, and that being now without any legitimate issue, for Elizabeth and Mary had been made illegitimate, he obtained from his Parliament the power of disposing of the crown by will—a stretch of prerogative hitherto without a precedent. Whether these events

do not reflect peculiar discredit upon the chief actor in the death of Anne Boleyn we leave it to our readers to determine.

The fate of Anne Boleyn at once arrested the attention of Europe, and inspired hopes at the Vatican that Henry would be reunited to the Church. Now that the spell of the dread enchantress had been rudely dissolved, it was confidently expected that the associations of early years would revive, that England once more would have a Catholic king, and that the events which had just occurred would pass away like a dream. The ministers of Erastianism, it was said, would be expelled from the fold, and the impious laws which had been enacted since 1529 would be repealed with acclamation. Nor were these hopes without foundation. The elements of discontent were strong in England; if the revolution which had just been accomplished had had many supporters, and had identified with it the majority of the nation, it had also created much discontent, and the country seemed hanging on the verge of insurrection. The national feeling against heresy was still paramount; and the Roman party had skilfully availed themselves of it, to excite discontent against the Reformation. Henry might well consider that a reconciliation with Rome, which should leave his newly acquired prerogatives untouched, but should nominally restore his kingdom to communion with the Church, and thereby allay the irritation of the Roman party, would be but a small price to pay for national quiet. It appears certain that in 1536 he contemplated such a course; and that he would have partially re-entered the Roman communion had not the turn of European politics, and the folly of Cardinal Pole determined him to keep in his former ways. It is indeed remarkable, as Mr. Froude observes, how in the long struggle between England and the Papacy, apparent accident frequently decided the ultimate issue. The discovery that Charles V. and Francis I. had been previously playing him false when, in 1536, they were soliciting his alliance, confirmed Henry in a policy of isolation from Europe, and thus saved him from the Papal influence; and the violent language of Reginald Pole, uttered exactly at the time that a peace with Rome was in contemplation, alienated the king still more from his reviving sympathies. And it is also fair to remark that even at this period the king's mind had begun to open to some of the unrealities of the ancient faith. In virtue of his supremacy over the Church he had commanded the bishops to make a translation of the Bible in English; and when the learned prelates had evaded the command, he had authorized himself the publication of Coverdale's version. This in fact was that of Tyndal, and Mr. Froude thus notices the first publication in England of the English Bible:—

'This was the introduction of the English Bible—this the seeming acknowledgment of Henry's services. Of the translation itself, though since that time it has been many times revised and altered, we may say that it is, substantially, the Bible with which we are all familiar. The peculiar genius—if such a word may be permitted—which breathes through it, the mingled tenderness and majesty, the Saxon simplicity, the preternatural grandeur, unequalled, unapproached in the attempted improvements of modern scholars, all are here, and bear the impress of the mind of one man, William Tyndal. Lying, while engaged in that great office under the shadow of death, the sword above his head, and ready at any moment to fall, he worked under circumstances alone, perhaps, truly worthy of the task which was laid upon him—his spirit, as it were divorced from the world, moved in a purer element than common air.'

The publication of the Bible in English appears very soon to have had a great effect upon the nation; and, more than anything else, to have turned men's minds towards Protestantism. Contemporaneously with it, was that of the first articles of the English faith, prepared, it is said, by Henry himself, and of a much less Catholic tendency than those which were subsequently promulgated. It is remarkable that, at the time of a strong political movement towards Rome, England should have been penetrated with the influences which finally were to make her Protestant in creed.

As yet, however, the real tendencies towards the Reformation in England were beneath the surface, and, to all appearance, the current of opinion was setting strongly towards Rome, in a great tide of discontent and insurrection. A variety of causes had made the new revolution unpopular, and had roused up a feeling of animosity against the Government. The old aristocracy looked disdainfully upon the new race of nobles which the changes of the times had suddenly elevated; they particularly disliked Cromwell as a domineering upstart; they had recently been shorn of some time-honoured privileges; and thus they identified the cause of the Reformation with that of these irritating innovations. Such of the clergy as still ventured to express an opinion were generally hostile to the actual state of things; and the majority of them held towards it an attitude of reluctant obedience. The country gentlemen regretted the destruction of the monasteries, 'the desecration of the familiar scenes of their daily life, and the violation of the tombs of their ancestors;' they looked with aversion upon the new proprietors who had possessed themselves of their sacred domains; and they lamented the absence of abbots who had been their personal friends, and of monks who had been the teachers of their children. And just at this time their feel-

ings had been aggravated by the enactment of the Statute of Uses,\* which restored to the crown a source of taxation which for some time they had evaded, and which besides bound anew their estates in the iron fetters of feudal tenure. Besides this there were many causes for complaint among the lower orders. The rents exacted by the new owners of the abbey lands were much higher than formerly they had been; the extinction of the religious houses had stopped up some channels of hospitality and commerce, and had thrown vast numbers of people out of employment; and, at the same time, the great social change of the sixteenth century, the conversion of arable land into pasture, and the consequent uprooting of the class of small tenants from their holdings, was progressing with extreme rapidity. And if we add to this that the deaths of Fisher and More had been generally reprobated; that the bitter feeling against the Church which had so recently animated the nation was beginning to give place to a kindly sympathy for her sufferings; that the usual results of persecution, in awakening pity for its objects, were commencing to fill the minds of the people; and that the contrast between the monks, dominant in idleness and luxury, and rudely thrust out in penury from their dwellings was stirring up the conservative tendencies of England, we can comprehend how the power of the Roman party grew greater daily, and how a strong opposition formed itself against the Government of Henry.

At last this opposition broke out into insurrection. The movement first took this form in Lincolnshire, but it soon subsided and ended in nothing, although for a moment it had united sixty thousand men in arms. It was in the northern counties that rebellion became really formidable, and for a time threatened to overturn the Tudor dynasty. It is due to Mr. Froude to state, that his narrative of the 'Pilgrimage of Grace' is not only perfect as a specimen of historical art, but is more complete and trustworthy than the account of any other historian. He does full justice to the ability and self-devotion of the rebel leaders, and brings out the character of Robert Aske in brilliant relief. We wish we could say that he is equally fair when narrating the conduct of the Government towards them; he glosses over its perfidy and want of honesty, and he struggles hard to excuse its calculating atrocity. But it is undoubtedly true that the throne of Henry VIII. was never in such peril as when the armies of Aske and Norfolk confronted each other; that had the Emperor and the Pope interfered with vigour at this juncture, the Roman party in

\* Mr. Froude has caught with great skill the true tendency of the Statute of Uses; but we conceive that he has misstated its real object. That object was to restore the feudal renders to the crown, not, as he thinks, to simplify titles.



England might finally have triumphed ; and that, therefore, the treatment of the rebel leaders by Henry's Government must be judged with a constant reference to surrounding circumstances. We have only space for a single extract from this admirable narrative, which is, perhaps, the triumph of Mr. Froude's volumes :—

‘As he (Aske) rode down at midnight to the bank of the Humber, the clash of the alarm bells came pealing far over the water. From hill to hill, from church tower to church tower, the warning lights were shooting. The fishermen on the German Ocean watched them flickering in the darkness from Spurnhead to Scarborough, from Scarborough to Berwick-upon-Tweed. They streamed westward, over the long marshes across Spalding Moor, up the Ouse and the Wharf, to the watershed where the rivers flow into the Irish Sea. The mountains of Westmoreland sent on the message to Kendal, to Cockermouth, to Penrith, to Carlisle ; and for days and nights there was one loud storm of bells and blaze of beacons from the Trent to the Cheviot Hills.’

This brilliant passage reminds us of the famous description of the herald-fire in the ‘*Agamemnon*’ of *Æschylus*, and of Lord Macaulay's stirring account of the beacons which blazed at the approach of the Armada, and indeed the entire episode is a specimen of historic beauty.

The strife between the Emperor and the King of France had prevented a Catholic coalition to aid the Pilgrims of Grace, and had been a chief cause of the safety of Henry. But the Pope and Cardinal Pole had done their utmost in the interest of the Church, and Pole had been sent to Liege to concert a conspiracy with the insurgents. Although these spiritual champions were unable to give efficient assistance to the rebels, they kept the government of Henry in constant alarm, and interpenetrated England with treasonable influences, which were again to break out in partial risings and plots, and once more to cause the shedding of noble and innocent blood. It was not enough that the Pilgrimage of Grace was over ; and that the market-places of England showed a ghastly row of heads as the spoils of rebellion. The throne of Henry was still insecure while exposed to foreign and domestic aggression ; and with characteristic firmness and craft he determined to establish it, at whatever cost of blood and treasure. In this policy he was ably seconded by Cromwell, who now was at the zenith of his fortunes, and if there is much in it we must condemn, we must not forget how it was provoked. Henry, as soon as possible after the northern rebellion, put his fleet in order, increased the strength of his forces, and along his coasts erected castles and fortresses.

‘The animus of foreign powers was evidently as bad as possible. Subjects shared the feelings of their rulers. The Pope might succeed,

and most likely would succeed at last, in reconciling France and Spain; and experience proved that England lay formidably open to attack. It was no longer safe to trust wholly to the extemporized militia. The introduction of artillery was converting war into a science; and the recent proofs of the unprotected condition of the harbours should not be allowed to pass without leaving their lesson. Commissions were issued for a survey of the whole eastern and southern coasts. The most efficient gentlemen residing in the counties which touched the sea were requested to send up reports of the points where invading armies could be most easily landed, with such plans as occurred to them for the best means of throwing up defences. The plans were submitted to engineers in London; and in two years every exposed spot upon the coast was guarded by an earthwork, or a fort, or block-house. Batteries were erected to protect the harbours at St. Michael's Mount, Falmouth, Fowey, Plymouth, Dartmouth, Torbay, Portland, Calshot, Cowes, and Portsmouth. Castles—some of them remain to the present day—were built at Dover, Deal, Sandwich, and along both shores of the Thames. The walls and embankments at Guisnes and Calais were repaired and enlarged; and Hull, Scarborough, Newcastle, and Berwick-upon-Tweed were made impregnable against ordinary attack. Each of these places was defended by adequate and trained garrisons; and the musters were kept in training within twenty miles of the coast, and were held in readiness to assemble on any point at any moment.

Money was the chief difficulty. The change in the character of war created unforeseen expenses of many kinds. The cost of regular military and naval establishments—a new feature in the national system—was thrown suddenly on the crown; and the revenue was unequal to so large a demand upon it. A fresh political arrangement was displacing the old; and the finances were necessarily long disordered before the country understood its condition, and had devised measures to meet its necessities.

At this conjuncture the abbey lands were a fortunate resource. They were disposed of rapidly, of course on easy terms to the purchasers. The insurrection, as we saw, had taught the necessity of filling the place of the monks with resident owners, who would maintain hospitality liberally, and on a scale to contrast favourably with the careless waste of their predecessors. Obligations to this effect were made a condition of the sales, and lowered naturally the market value of the properties. Considerable sums, however, were realized, adequate for immediate objects, though falling short of the ultimate cost of the defences of the country. At the same time the government works found labour for the able-bodied beggars, those sturdy vagrants whose living had been gathered hitherto at the doors of the religious houses, varied only with intervals of the stocks and the cart's tail.

Thus the spoils of the Church furnished the arms by which the Pope and the Pope's friends could be held at bay; and by degrees in the healthier portion of the nation an English enthusiasm took the

place of a superstitious panic. Loyalty towards England went along with the Reformation, when the Reformation was menaced by foreign enemies; and the wide disaffection which, in 1536, had threatened a revolution, became concentrated in a vindictive minority, to whom the Papacy was dearer than their country, and whose persevering conspiracies taught England at no distant time to acquiesce with its whole heart in the wisdom which chained them down by penal laws as traitors and enemies to the commonwealth.'

In this energetic resolution there is much to applaud, and Henry, like Elizabeth, shines with peculiar lustre, when he is summoning up his people and protecting his country against foreign invasion. But there is a reverse of this picture, in the cruel persecution which at this time arose in consequence of the Act of Supremacy. Henry had resolved to make obedience to the statute the test of religion and loyalty; and Mr. Froude thus narrates the execution of Friar Forest for disobeying it:—

'In an official paper of 'about this date I find 'heresy' to be 'that which is against Scripture.' 'To say, therefore, that Peter and his successors be heads of the universal Church, and stand stubbornly in it, is heresy, because it is against Scripture (Ecclesiastes v.), where it is written *in super universæ terre rex imperat servienti*—that is to say, the king commandeth the whole country as his subjects; and therefore it followeth that the Bishop of Rome, which is in Italy where the emperor is king, is subject to the emperor, and that the emperor may command him. And if he should be head of the Universal Church, then he should be head over the emperor, and command the emperor, and that is directly against the said text, Ecclesiastes v.: wherefore to stand in it opiniatively is heresy.' In the spirit, if not in the letter of this monstrous reasoning, Forest was indicted for heresy in a court where we would gladly believe that Crammer did not sit as president. He was found guilty, and was delivered over, in the usual form, to the secular arm.

'An accidental coincidence contributed to the dramatic effect of his execution. In a chapel at Llan Dderfel, in North Wales, there had stood a figure of an ancient Welsh saint, called Dderfel Gadern. The figure was a general favourite. The Welsh people 'came daily in pilgrimage to him, some with kyne, some with oxen and horses, and the rest with money, insomueh' (I quote a letter of Ellis Price, the Merionethshire visitor) 'that there were five or six hundred, to a man's estimation, that offered to the said image the fifth day of this month of April. The innocent people hath been sore allured and enticed to worship, insomuch that there is a common saying amongst them that, whosoever will offer anything to the image of Dderfel Gadern, he hath power to fetch him, or them that so offer, out of hell.' The visitor desired to know what he should do with Dderfel Gadern, and received orders to dispatch the thing at once to London. The parishioners offered to subscribe forty pounds to preserve their profitable possession,

but in vain—Cromwell was ruthless. The image was sent to the same destination with the rest of his kind; and, arriving opportunely, it was hewn into fuel to form the pile, where the victim of the new heresy court was to suffer.

'A day ~~at~~ the end of May was fixed for Forest's death. Latimer was selected to preach on the occasion; and a singular letter remains from him, from which I try to gather that he accepted reluctantly the ungrateful service. 'Sir,' he addressed Cromwell, 'if it be your pleasure, as it is, that I shall play the fool after my customable manner when Forest shall suffer, I would wish that my stage stood near unto Forest, for I would endeavour myself so to content the people, that therewith I might also convert Forest, God so helping, or rather, altogether working. Wherefore I would that he shall hear what I shall say—*si forte*. If he would yet with his heart return to his abjuration, I would wish his pardon. Such is my foolishness.' The gleam of pity, though so faint and feeble that it seemed a thing to be ashamed of, is welcome from that hard time. The preparations were made with a horrible completeness. It was the single supremacy case which fell to the conduct of ecclesiastics; and ecclesiastics of all professions, in all ages, have been fertile in ingenious cruelty. A gallows was erected over the stake, from which the wretched victim was to be suspended in a cradle of chains. When the machinery was complete, and the chips of the idol lay ready, he was brought out, and placed upon a platform. The Lord Mayor, the Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk, Lord Southampton, and Cromwell, were present with a pardon, if at the last moment his courage should fail, and he would ask for it. The sermon began. It was of the usual kind—the passionate language of passionate conviction. When it was over, Latimer turned to Forest, and asked him whether he would live or die. 'I will die,' was the gallant answer. 'Do your worst upon me. Seven years ago you durst not, for your life, have preached such words as these. And now, if an angel from heaven should come down and teach me any other doctrine than that which I learnt as a child, I would not believe him. Take me; cut me to pieces, joint from joint. Burn—hang—do what you will—I will be true henceforth to my faith.' It was enough. He was laid upon his iron bed, and slung off into the air, and the flame was kindled. In his mortal agony he clutched at the steps of the ladder, to sway himself out of the blaze; and the pitiless chronicler, who records the scene, could see only in this last weakness an evidence of guilt. 'So impatiently,' says Hall, 'he took his death as never any man that put his trust in God.'

Strange, indeed, is the contrast between the heroism of the Government which could haughtily confront a menacing Europe, and which excites all our admiration by its energetic attitude, and the base and cruel fanaticism which could thus extinguish a noble spirit, and array against itself some of the most tenacious elements of resistance. It is indeed true, as Lord Macaulay remarks, that the mind of England has softened while it has

ripened, and that while its valour has not declined, its humanity has grown with a happy growth.

In the meantime, Jane Seymour had died, and for a short period there was a prospect of peace between Charles V. and Henry. The commanding position which the King of England occupied made him an object of alliance, and even a matrimonial prize; and for a while he seemed likely to marry the Duchess of Milan—the niece of the Emperor. But mutual jealousy, the intrigues of Francis I., and the continued interference of the Pope, rendered the scheme abortive; a truce for ten years was made between the Emperor and the French king; and, once more, England was left in isolation from the Continent. But the peril of the Pilgrimage of Grace was passed; and though not free from that of secret conspiracy, Henry had strengthened and consolidated his power, and was now able to defy his enemies abroad and at home. He rallied around him the National party in the interest of English independence, and in reply to all the threats of foreign aggression, he recommenced a crusade against the Roman faction. Here the destroying genius and hand of Cromwell were conspicuous. The greater abbeys shared the fate of the lesser, and were overthrown or converted into cathedrals; and the large majority of them were soon merely heaps of ruins. Every license was given to expose and to destroy the insignia of the ancient faith; the magnificent imagery of Catholicism was given over to havoc; multitudes of shrines were reduced to ruins; and, in proof of the final triumph of Erastianism, the bones of Thomas à Becket were scattered to the winds. Mr. Froude thus narrates an event, which in the then state of opinion in Europe, appeared the most fearful of sacrileges.

‘The opportunity was taken to settle accounts in full with the hero of the English Church. On the 30th of September the shrine and the relics were shown, perhaps for the last time, to Madame de Montreuil, and a party of French ladies. In the following month the bones of the martyr who for centuries had been venerated throughout Europe, which peers and princes had crossed the seas to look upon, which tens of thousands of pilgrims year after year for all those ages had crowded to reverence, were torn from their hallowed resting-place, and burnt to powder, and scattered to the winds. The golden plating of the shrine, the emeralds and rubies, the votive offerings of the whole Christian world, were packed in chests, and despatched to the treasury. The chiselled stone was splintered with hammers. The impressions worn upon the pavement by the millions of knees which had bent in adoration there, alone remained to tell of the glory which had been. Simultaneously with the destruction of his remains, Becket's name was erased out of the service books, the innumerable church windows in which his history was painted were broken, the day which commemorated his mar-

tyrdom was forbidden to be observed; and in explanation of so exceptional a vehemence an official narrative was published by the Government of the circumstances of his end, in which he was described as a traitor to the State, who had perished in a scuffle provoked by his own violence.'

The outrage against Thomas à Becket aroused once more the indignation of the Pope, the sympathetic anger of the Catholic powers, and the expiring wrath of the Roman party in England. Paul III. at length promulgated the famous Bull of Deposition, which had been composed four years before, and Reginald Pole a second time went forth upon his mission to preach a crusade against the heretical tyrant. The relations of Charles V. and Henry became visibly cooler, and rumours soon reached England that another Catholic league, which should embrace the Emperor and the French king, was in preparation. And at the same time the condition of Ireland became menacing, and a suspicion went abroad that the Marquis of Exeter, the Nevilles, and the Poles were planning a new insurrection. The resolute Tudor did not flinch for an instant, but again hurled defiance at his enemies. Conscious that the real danger lay at home, and that if a second Pilgrimage of Grace were to break out while England was isolated from all allies, the consequences might be destructive to his dynasty, he unhesitatingly struck down his domestic foes by implicating the Nevilles, Poles, and Exeters in a charge of high treason, and sending all of the family within his reach, except Lady Salisbury, to immediate death. As he was sustained in this act by the National party, which invariably became uppermost when England was menaced with danger from abroad, the continental alliance against him became less resolute, and once more the Catholic league melted away into nothing. It had been, however, very threatening, and we must admire the bold energy which dispelled it. Mr. Froude thus eloquently tells us of it:—

'The point of attack would probably be the open coast of Kent. An army would be landed on the beach somewhere between Sandwich and Dover, and would march on London. Leaving Cromwell to see to the defence of the metropolis, Henry went down in person to examine his new fortresses, and to speak a few words of encouragement to the garrisons. The merchant ships in the Thames were taken up by the Government and armed. Lord Southampton took command of the fleet at Portsmouth; Lord Russell was sent into the west; Lord Surrey into Norfolk. The beacons were fresh trimmed; the musters through the country were ordered to be in readiness. Sir Ralph Sadler, the king's private secretary, sent from Dover to desire Cromwell to lose no time in setting London in order. 'Use your diligence,' he wrote, 'for his Grace says that diligence passe sense; willing me to write that French proverb unto your lordship, the rather to quicken

you in that behalf. Surely his Majesty mindeth nothing more than, like a courageous prince of valiant heart, to prepare and be in readiness, in all events, to encounter the malice of his enemies. In which part, no doubt, Almighty God will be his helper; and all good subjects will employ themselves to the uttermost, both lives and goods, to serve his Highness truly. . . All that will be contrary, God send them ill-hap and short life.'

'The inspection proving satisfactory, Sir Thomas Cheyne was left at Dover Castle, with command of the coast from the mouth of the Thames westward. We catch sight through March and April of soldiers gathering and moving. Look-out vessels hung about the Channell, watching the Flanders ports. One morning, when the darkness lifted, sixty strange sail were found at anchor in the Downs; and swiftly two thousand men were in arms upon the sandflats towards Deal. Cheyne never took off his clothes for a fortnight. Strong easterly gales were blowing, which would bring the fleet across in a few hours. 'Mr. Fletcher, of Rye,' in a boat of his own construction, 'which he said had no fellow in England,' beat up in the wind's eye to Dover, 'of his own mind to serve the King's Majesty.' At day-break he would be off Gravelings, on the look-out; at noon he would be in the new harbour, with reports to the English commander. Day after day the huge armada lay motionless. At length sure word was brought that an order had been sent out for every captain, horseman, and footman, to be on board on the first of March. In a few days, the truth, whatever it was, would be known. The easterly winds were the chief cause of anxiety. If England was their object, they would come so quickly, Cheyne said, that although watch was kept night and day all along the coast, yet, 'if evil were, the best would be a short warning for any number of men to repulse them at their landing.' However his information led him to think the venture would not be made.

'He was right. A few days later the look-out boats brought the welcome news that the fleet had broken up. Part withdrew to the ports of Zealand, where the stores and cannon were relanded, and the vessels dismasted. Part were seen bearing down Channell, before the wind, bound for Spain and the Mediterranean; and Cromwell, who had an ague-fit from anxiety, informed the king on the 19th of April that he had received private letters from Antwerp, telling him that the enterprise had been relinquished from the uncertainty which appeared of success.

'Such in fact was the truth. The Emperor, longing, and yet fearing to invade, and prepared to make the attempt if he could be satisfied of a promising insurrection in his support, saw in the swift and easy extinction of the Marquis of Exeter's conspiracy an evidence of Henry's strength, which Pole's eloquence could not gainsay. He had waited, uncertain perhaps, till time had proved the consequences of the execution; and when he found that the country was in arms, but only to oppose the invaders whom the English legate had promised it would welcome as deliverers, he was too wise to risk an overthrow which would have broken his power in Germany, and insured the enduring enmity

of England. The time, he told the Pope, did not serve; and to a second more anxious message, he replied that he could not afford to quarrel with Henry till Germany was in better order. The King of France might act as he pleased. He would not interfere with him. For himself, when the German difficulty was once settled, he would then take up arms and avenge the Pope's injuries and his own. Once more Pole had failed.'

From this time the throne of Henry was secure from treason at home, and Catholic coalitions abroad. The Roman party was finally crushed during his reign, and did not again lift its head until it reappeared under Mary Tudor. Its downfall is marked by the slaughter of the Countess of Salisbury—the most prominent figure of the White Rose and reactionary faction—and by the executions of the abbots of Glastonbury, Reading, and Colchester. The Catholic powers did not coalesce again against England; Charles V. and Francis I. once more renewed their internecine strife; and the position of Henry in Europe became more commanding than ever. His conquests in Ireland, his successes of arms and policy in Scotland, and his despotism in England, made him more formidable and powerful than hitherto he had been. But with the cessation of dangers from abroad, the religious factions in England broke out anew in war, and the forces of Anglo-Catholicism and Protestantism met in desperate conflict. Once more the Catholic sympathies of England revived, and arrayed an overwhelming opposition against Cromwell and the Protestants. It is indeed remarkable and instructive to observe how strongly the old faith was rooted in the hearts of Englishmen; and how, whenever it became dissociated from the cause of the Pope and of foreign aggression, it reasserted its old supremacy. At present its influence carried the nation with it. The House of Lords were inspired by it and by a jealous hatred into a settled resolution to thwart Cromwell and his adherents. The House of Commons became exceedingly conservative; now that they were free from the Papal jurisdiction they determined to purge themselves from heresy; and they repudiated as unbelief any doctrines that had been associated with the revolutionary excesses of Germany. So, too, the nation in general regretted the monasteries, and connected the heavy taxation which was beginning to press on them, with the decline of the old religion, and the changes of the times. The Anglo-Catholic prelates, especially Gardiner, promoted these tendencies with all their efforts; they resolved to support Erastianism if they could not have Popery; and they evinced the most determined opposition against any doctrinal innovations. This Catholic reaction produced the Statute of the Six Articles, which marks the zenith of



Erastian Catholicism in England. Mr. Froude thus narrates its enactment :—

‘In spite of Cranmer’s unwearied and brave opposition, the harshest penalties which were recommended received the greatest favour; and ‘the bloody Act of the Six Articles,’ or ‘the whip with six strings,’ as it was termed by the Protestants, was the adopted remedy to heal the diseases of England. After a careful preamble, in which the danger of divisions and false opinions, the peril both to the peace of the Commonwealth, and the souls of those who were ensnared by heresy, were elaborately dwelt upon, the king, the two Houses of Parliament, and the convocations of the two provinces declared themselves, after a great and long, delicate and advised disputation, to have adopted the following conclusions :—

‘1. That in the most blessed sacrament of the altar, by the strength and efficacy of Christ’s mighty word, it being spoken by the priest, was present really, under the form of bread and wine, the natural body and blood of Jésus Christ; and that, after consecration, there remained no substance of bread and wine, nor any other but the substance of Christ.

‘2. That communion in both kinds was not essential to salvation; that under the form of bread, the blood was present as well as the body; and, under the form of wine, the flesh was present as well as the blood.

‘3. That it was not permitted to priests, after their ordination, to marry and have wives.

‘4. That vows of chastity made to God advisedly by man or woman ought to be observed, and were of perpetual obligation.

‘5. That private masses ought to be continued, as meet and necessary for godly consolation and benefit.

‘6. That auricular confession to a priest must be retained, and continue to be used in the Church.

‘The Lords and Commons, in accepting the articles, gave especial thanks to his Majesty for the godly pain, study, and travail with which he had laboured to establish them; and they ‘prayed God that he might long reign to bring his godly enterprise to a full end and perfection;’ and that by these means ‘quiet, unity, and concord might be had in the whole body of the realm for ever.’

‘On their side they enacted against such persons as should refuse to submit to the resolutions :—

‘That whoever, by word or writing, denied the first article, should be declared a heretic, and suffer death by burning, without opportunity of abjuration, without protection from sanctuary or benefit of clergy. Whoever spoke or otherwise broke the other five articles, or any one of them, should, for the first offence, forfeit his property; if he offended a second time, or refused to abjure when called to answer, he should suffer death as a felon. All marriages hitherto contracted by priests were declared void. A day was fixed before which their wives were to be sent to their friends, and to retain them after that day was felony. To refuse to go to confession was felony. To refuse to receive

the sacrament was felony. On every road on which the free mind of man was moving the dark sentinel of orthodoxy was stationed with its flaming sword; and in a little time all cowards, all who had adopted the new opinions with motives less pure than that deep zeal and love which alone entitle human beings to constitute themselves champions of God, flinched into their proper nothingness, and left the battle to the brave and the good.'

It is unnecessary to notice the cruel persecutions which took place under this famous statute, for they are familiar to every student of our history; but it is remarkable that even they did not satisfy the mitred champions of orthodoxy; that they struggled hard to stretch the law beyond its proper bounds; that they kept on calling upon the State for larger powers, while they were zealously stifling true religion by suppressing the Bible; and that at length the king interposed against them.

And now the Anglo-Catholic party, confident of success, directed all their energies towards the destruction of Cromwell. The minister struggled against his foes fiercely and long; he renewed his attempts to connect the king with the German Protestants by uniting him in marriage with Anne of Cleves; and he endeavoured to entangle Gardiner within the Act of Supremacy. He also laboured hard to control the elections; and the following picture of ministerial 'management' in the Tudor period is given to us by Mr. Froude:—

'Letters survive throwing curious light on the history of this election. We see the Cromwell faction straining their own and the crown's influence as far as it would bear to secure a majority—sailing in one place, succeeding in another—sending their agents throughout the country, demanding support, or entreating it, as circumstances allowed; or, when they were able, coercing the voters with a high hand. Care was taken to secure the return of efficient speakers to defend the Government measures; and Cromwell, by his exertions and by his anxiety, enables us to measure the power of the crown both within Parliament and without; to conclude with certainty that danger was feared from opposition, and that the control of the Cabinet over the representation of England was very limited.

'The returns for the boroughs were determined by the chief owners of property within the limits of the franchise; those for the counties depended on the great landholders. In the late parliament Cromwell wrote to some gentleman, desiring him to come forward as the Government candidate for Huntingdonshire. He replied that the votes of the county were already promised, and unless his competitors could be induced to resign he could not offer himself. In Shropshire, on the call of Parliament to examine the treasons of Anne Boleyn, there was a division of interest. 'The worshipful of the shire' desired to return a supporter of Cromwell; the sheriff, the undersheriff, and the townspeople

were on the other side. The election was held at Shrewsbury, and the inhabitants assembled riotously, overawed the voters, and carried the opposition member by intimidation. • On the present occasion, Lord Southampton went in person round Surrey, Sussex, and Hampshire, where his own property was situated. The election for Surrey he reported himself able to carry with certainty. At Guildford he manoeuvred to secure both seats, but was only able to obtain one. He was anticipated for the other by a Guildford townsman, whom the mayor and burgesses told him that they all desired. Sir William Goring and Sir John Gage were standing on the Court interest for Sussex. Sir John Dawtry, of Petworth, and Lord Maltravers, had promised their support, and Southampton hoped that they might be considered safe. Farnham was 'the Bishop of Winchester's town,' where he 'spared to meddle' without Cromwell's express orders. If the bishop's good intentions could be relied upon,\* interference might provoke gratuitous ill-feeling. He had friends in the town, however, and he could make a party if Cromwell thought it necessary. In Portsmouth and Southampton the Government influence was naturally paramount, through the dockyards, and the establishments maintained in them. So far nothing can be detected more irregular than might have been found in the efforts of any prime minister before the Reform Bill to secure a manageable House of Commons. At Oxford, however, we find Cromwell positively dictating the choice of a member; and at Canterbury a case occurred too remarkable for its arbitrary character to be passed over without particular mention. The suppression of the two great abbeys had, for the moment, left the crown the absolute proprietor of the larger portions of the town. Christchurch had not yet been converted into a chapter; the lands of St. Augustine had not yet been disposed of; all the strength, therefore, which property could confer, with the further irresponsibility in the use of it, which he gained from his position, was wielded by Cromwell, and with noticeable despotism. Directions had been sent down from London for the election of two Government nominees. An answer was returned stating humbly that the order had come too late—that two members of the corporation of Canterbury were already returned. I have failed to discover Cromwell's rejoinder; but a week later the following letter was addressed to him by the mayor and burgesses:—

'In humble wise we certify you that the 20th day of the present month, at six o'clock in the morning, I, John Alcock, Mayor of Canterbury, received your letter directed to me, the said mayor, sheriff, and commonalty of the said city, signifying to us thereby the king's pleasure and commandment, that Robert Sacknell and John Bridges should be burgesses of the Parliament for the same city of Canterbury; by virtue whereof, according to our bounden duty, immediately upon the sight of your said letter, and contents thereof perceived, we caused the commonalty of the said city to assemble in the court-hall, where appeared the number of fourscore and seventeen persons—citizens and inhabitants of the

\* This, however, was scarcely probable.

said city; and according to the king's pleasure and commandment, freely with one voice, and without any contradiction, have elected and chosen the said Robert Sacknell and John Bridges to be burgesses of the Parliament for the same city, which shall be duly certified by indenture under the seal of the said citizens and inhabitants, by the grace of the blessed Trinity.'

'The previous election, therefore,\* had been set aside by the absolute will of the crown, and the hope that so violent a proceeding might be explained tolerably through some kind of decent resignation, is set aside by a further letter stating that one of the persons originally chosen, having presumed to affirm that he was a 'true and proper burgess of the city,' he had been threatened into submission by a prospect of the loss of a lucrative office which he held under the corporation.\*'

But all Cromwell's efforts to save himself proved in vain. The German alliance of Henry led to a momentary reconciliation between the Emperor and the French king, and although no coalition against England appears to have been contemplated, it probably increased the danger of the tottering minister. The marriage of Anne of Cleves proved singularly unfortunate; it had been the work of Cromwell, and was dissolved suddenly by Convocation, to the eternal disgrace of all parties concerned; and the measure of its projector was now overflowing. The Protestant party had recently been indulging in some excesses, and were chafing under their Anglo-Catholic persecutors; and an opportunity was taken to entangle Cromwell in a charge of high-treason, on account of some words he had incautiously spoken with regard to them. Accusations of heresy were easily made forthcoming; the whole weight of the Anglo-Catholic party, headed by Norfolk and Gardiner, was thrown into the scale against their victim; and soon a ruthless Parliamentary attainder had closed the career of one of the greatest of the ministers of England. On Tower-green he perished by the same death which he had prepared for Sir Thomas More and Lady Salisbury, abandoned, as Wolsey had been abandoned before, by the king, to whom he had been only too exact a servant. Mr. Froude judiciously keeps out of sight Henry's conduct on this occasion, which reveals all his selfish and hard nature; and he thus glosses over the end of Cromwell:—

'The curtain now rises on the closing act of the Cromwell tragedy.

\* This is almost the only passage in his history in which Mr. Froude gives us his idea of the Tudor polity. And to us this despotic interference with the election of Canterbury, undertaken as a matter of course, accomplished without resistance, and not protested against in Parliament or elsewhere, seems conclusive as to the dependence of the Houses upon the crown. Indeed, the slavish temper of the House of Lords is sufficiently evident from many authorities of the period.

In the condemned cells in the Tower, the three Catholics for whose sentence he was himself answerable—the three Protestants whom his fall had left exposed to their enemies—were the sad companions of the broken minister; and there for six weeks he himself, the central figure, whose will had made many women childless, had sat waiting his own unpitied doom. Twice the king had sent to him ‘honourable persons’ to receive such explanations as he could offer. He had been patiently and elaborately heard. Twice he had himself written—once, by Henry’s desire on account of the Anne of Cleves marriage—once a letter which his faithful friend Sir Ralph Sadler carried to Henry for him; and this last the king caused the bearer three times to read over, and ‘seemed to be moved therewith.’ Yet what had Cromwell to say? That he had done his best in the interest of the commonwealth. But his best was better than the laws of the commonwealth. He had endeavoured faithfully to serve the king; but he had endeavoured also to serve One higher than the king. He had thrown himself in the breach against king and people where they were wrong. He had used the authority with which he had been so largely trusted, to thwart the Parliament and suspend statutes of the realm. He might plead his services; but what would his services avail him? An offence in the king’s eyes was ever proportioned to the rank, the intellect, the character of the offender. The *via media Anglicana*, on which Henry had planted his foot, prescribed an even justice; and as Cromwell, in the name of the *via media*, had struck down without mercy the adherents of the Church of Rome, there was no alternative but to surrender him to the same equitable rule, or to declare to the world, and to himself, that he no longer held that middle place which he so vehemently claimed. To sustain the Six Articles and to pardon the viceregent was impossible. If the consent to the attainder cost the king any pang, we do not know; only this we know, that a passionate appeal for mercy, such as was rarely heard in those days of haughty endurance, found no response; and on the 28th of July the most despotic minister that ever governed England passed from the Tower to the scaffold.’

From this period until the close of Henry’s reign, the Anglo-Catholic party remained triumphant, and marked their authority by cruel persecution. The prelates struggled to prove to Europe that a schism with Rome was consistent with fanatic intolerance; and the tragedy of Anne Askew, as late as 1546, was only one of a long series of Protestant martyrdoms. The king again entered the marriage state, and once more his wife became his victim; but though Catherine Howard belonged to the dominant faction, her fall did not involve its power. Erastianism and despotism were now indeed paramount. The submissive Church bowed to the imperious monarch, and appeared to have forgotten its Roman sympathies. It had lost a chief source of independence in the abolition of the monastic orders, and it began to evince that pecu-

liar devotion to the crown—a source alike of strength and of weakness—which has always characterized the Church of England. The Houses of Lords and Commons were equally pliable; the new aristocracy, which had been formed out of the holders of the abbey-lands, were always ready at the sovereign's bidding; and Henry was enabled to exact a benevolence, to debase the currency, and to send noble victims to Tower-green with no check upon him. But just before his death symptoms of a religious and political change began to show themselves. As the young generation which had been born during the Reformation became men, and was made familiar with gospel teaching in its native tongue, it seems to have somewhat advanced in notions of tolerance; and the contest between Gardiner, Cranmer, and Hertford, in 1545-6, and the attainders of Norfolk and Surrey, in 1547, betrayed the decline of the Anglo-Catholic party. Mr. Froude thus notices this slow revolution:—

‘Sixteen years had now elapsed since the memorable meeting of Parliament in 1529; and in those years the usurpation of Rome had been abolished; the phantom which overshadowed Europe had become a laughing-stock; the clergy for four centuries had been the virtual rulers in State and Church; their authority had extended over castle and cottage; they had monopolized the learned professions, and every man who could read was absorbed under the privileges of their order; supreme in the cabinet, in the law courts, and in the legislature, they had treated the Parliament as a shadow of convocation, and the House of Commons as an instrument to raise a revenue, the administration of which was theirs: their gigantic prerogatives had now passed away from them; the convocation which had prescribed laws to the State, endured the legislation of the Commons, even on the Articles of the Faith; the religious houses were swept away; their broad lands had relapsed to the laity with the powers which the ownership conveyed with it; the mitred abbots had ceased to exist; the temporal lords had a majority in the House of Peers; and the bishops battled ineffectually to maintain the last fragment of their independent grandeur.

Tremendous as the outward overthrow must have seemed to those who remembered the old days, the inward changes were yet more momentous. A superstition which was but the counterpart of magic and witchcraft, which buried the Father of heaven and earth in the coffins of the saints, and trusted the salvation of the soul to the efficacy of mumbled words, had given place to a real, though indistinct religion. Copies of the Bible were spread over the country in tens of thousands. Every English child was taught in its own tongue the Lord's prayer, and the Creed, and the Commandments. Idolatry existed no longer; and the remaining difficulties lay only in the interpretation of the Sacred Text, and in the clinging sense which adhered to all sides alike, that to misunderstand it was not an error but

a crime. Here, although Catholic doctrine, not only in its practical corruptions, but in its purest 'developments,' shook at the contact with the Gospels, yet the most thoughtful had been compelled to pause embarrassed. If mistake was fatal, and if the divine nature and the divine economy could not be subject to change, to reject the interpretations on which that doctrine had maintained itself, was to condemn the Christian Church to have been deserted for a thousand years by the spirit of truth, and this was a conclusion too frightful, too incredible to be endured. The laity, so bold against the Pope and the monasteries, turned their faces from it, into the dogmatism of the Six Articles.

'Yet still the stream flowed on, caring little for human opposition. To swim with it, or to swim against it, affected little the velocity with which the English world was swept into the new era. The truth stole into men's minds they knew not how. The king, as we have seen, began to shrink from persecution, and to shelter suspected persons from orthodox cruelty. The Parliament which would not yet alter the heresy law, tempered the action of it, and was rather contented to retard a movement which threatened to be too widely precipitate than attempt any more to arrest it.'

But if the internal features of the latter part of Henry's reign disclose much of despotism and misgovernment, there is much to admire in its external relations. The king reduced Ireland to something like obedience and order, and foreshadowed the policy which eventually was carried out under Elizabeth and James I. in a far less scrupulous manner. Although there is much to condemn in his conduct towards Scotland, it is impossible to deny its vigour and capacity, and its statesmanlike tendency in many particulars. He, first of English sovereigns, steadily projected the Union, and for years devoted his energy and craft to accomplish it. And we see the full Tudor ability in his bold attitude towards Charles V. when deserted by him at the peace of Crepy, and in his defence of England from the French invasion of 1546. Mr. Froude is entitled to great commendation for his narrative of these most important events. His account of the different factions of Scotland, and of the cautious but steadfast policy of Henry, in such marked contrast with the vacillation of James V., is very superior to that of any other historian; and his narrative of the great French attack is quite a masterpiece of description. Let us hope that he may yet give us a picture of the great Armada; for his sea-pieces have a peculiar beauty. Here is that of the sack of Edinburgh in 1544 by the English fleet:—

'Looking now through the eyes of Knox, let us imagine ourselves at Edinburgh on the morning of Saturday the 3rd. of May, 1544. The regent and Beton were at Holyrood, in enjoyment of the confi-

denœ of the people, and the heroes of Scottish independence. In spite of rumour and expectation, they were incredulous of danger. The preparations of the English might have been known, but they were supposed to be intended for France. The strength of their enemies on the sea was a new phenomenon of which they had no experience, and, without experience, could have no belief. The Channël had been free to their cruisers: they had ravaged the English coasts, and robbed English traders, from Berwick to the Land's End. An invasion in their own waters was the last peril which seemed to have been anticipated. Soon after daybreak strange ships were reported inside the Bass Rock. As the sun rose the numbers appeared more considerable, the white sails passing in from seaward, and coming up the Forth in a stream, of which the end was still invisible. The good citizens went out upon the Castle Hill and Arthur's Seat, and 'to crags and places eminent,' to gaze on the unintelligible spectacle—the silent vessels, countless as a flight of sea-birds, appearing from behind the horizon, and covering the blue level of the water. What were they? What did they mean? Mid-day came; they drew nearer in the light air, and keen eyes saw on the leading ships the flutter of St. George's Cross. But 'still sat the cardinal at his dinner, showing as though there had been no danger appearing.' The English were come, was the cry. The English were come to destroy them. 'The cardinal skippit and said, it is but the Ireland fleet; they are come to make us a show, and to put us in fears.' It would soon be known what they were. The first line as they came off Leith rounded up into the wind, dropped their anchors, and lay motionless. One by one, as the rest followed in, they took their places in the floating forest. While the sun was still in the sky the anxious watchers counted two hundred sail.

'No message came on shore. There was neither signal nor offer to communicate; only in the twilight boats were seen stealing out from under the shadow of the hulls, taking soundings, as it seemed, under Grantoun crags, and round the eastern edges of the harbour.

'The brief May night closed in. By the dawning of Sunday the whole sea was alive with life. The galleys and lighter transports were moving in towards the land. Soldiers were swarming on the decks of the ships, or passing down over the sides into the barges. It was the English army come indeed in its might and terror. The port was open, and the undefended town could attempt no resistance. The inhabitants fled up into Edinburgh, entering at one gate, as, at another, Arran and the cardinal were dashing out at the best speed of their swiftest horses. Before noon ten thousand men had disembarked in the leisure of overwhelming strength. The owners of the desolate houses had saved nothing. The merchants' stock was in their warehouses, and everything which was found was quietly appropriated. The joints of meat which had been provided for the Sunday dinners were cooked and consumed by the English men-at-arms. In the afternoon Blackness Castle was broken open, and the State prisoners, Sir George Douglas and Lord Angus among them, were dismissed to liberty.'



And here is the description of the attack of the French fleet in 1545:—

‘The king was at Portsmouth, having gone down to review the fleet, when, on the 18th of July, two hundred sail were reported at the back of the Isle of Wight. The entire force of the enemy, which had been collected, had been safely transported across the Channel. With boats feeling the way in front with sounding lines, they rounded St. Helen’s Point, and took up their position in a line which extended from Brading harbour almost to Ryde. In the light evening breeze fourteen English ships stood across to reconnoitre: D’Annebault came to meet them with the galleys, and there was some distant firing; but there was no intention of an engagement. The English withdrew, and night closed in.

‘The morning which followed was breathlessly calm. Lisle’s fleet lay all inside in the Spit, the heavy sails hanging motionless on the yards, the smoke from the chimneys of the cottages on shore rising in blue columns straight up into the air. It was a morning beautiful with the beauty of an English summer and an English sea; but, for the work before him, Lord Lisle would have gladly heard the west wind among his shrouds. At this time he had not a galley to oppose to the five-and-twenty which D’Annebault had brought with him; and in such weather the galleys had all the advantages of the modern gun-boats. From the single long gun which each of them carried in the bow, they poured shot for an hour into the tall stationary hulls of the line-of-battle ships; and, keeping in constant motion, they were themselves in perfect security. According to the French account of the action, the *Great Harry* suffered so severely as almost to be sunk at her anchorage; and, had the calm continued, they believed that they could have destroyed the entire fleet. As the morning drew on, however, the off-shore breeze sprung up suddenly; the large ships began to glide through the water; a number of frigates—long narrow vessels—so swift, the French said, that they could outsail their fastest shallows—came out with ‘incredible swiftness;’ and the fortune of the day was changed. The enemy were afraid to turn, lest they should be run over; if they attempted to escape into the wind they would be cut off from their own fleet. The main line advanced barely in time to save them; and the English, whose object was to draw the enemy into action under the guns of their own fortresses, and among the shoals of the Spit, retired to their old ground. The loss on both sides had been insignificant; but the occasion was rendered memorable by a misfortune. The *Mary Rose*, a ship of six hundred tons, and one of the finest in the navy, was among the vessels engaged with the galleys. She was commanded by Sir George Carew, and manned with a crew, who were said, all of them, to be fitter, in their own conceit, to order than obey, and to be incompetent for ordinary work. The ports were open for the action, the guns were run out, and in consequence of the calm had been imperfectly secured. The breeze rising suddenly, and the vessel laying over, the windward tier slipped across the deck, and as she yielded further to the weight, the lee-ports were depressed below the

water-line, the ship instantly filled, and carried down with her every soul who was on board. Almost at the same moment, the French treasure-ship *La Maitresse*, was also reported to be sinking. She had been strained at sea, and the shock of her own cannon completed the mischief. There was but just time to save her crew, and remove the money-chest, when she too was disabled. She was towed to the mouth of Brading Harbour, and left on shore.\*

At length, in January, 1547, Henry VIII. was summoned to his final account. Historians will probably always differ about the character of a man who, if judged by what he accomplished, must be considered great, if carefully looked at will display a mixed nature of energy, craft, selfishness, and recklessness, if viewed superficially will appear a monster of crimes. Mr. Froude thus gives us his idea of him, which is formed entirely from a contemplation of his achievements, and seems to us absurdly favourable:—

‘That the Romanists should have regarded him as a tyrant is natural; and were it true that English subjects owed fealty to the Pope, their feeling was just. But, however desirable it may be to leave religious opinion unfettered, it is certain that, if England was legitimately free, she could tolerate no difference of opinion on a question of allegiance, so long as Europe was conspiring to bring her back into slavery. So long as the Romanists refused to admit without mental reservation that, if foreign enemies invaded this country in the Pope’s name, their place must be at the side of their own sovereign, ‘religion’ might palliate the moral guilt of their treason, but it could not exempt them from its punishment.

‘But these matters have been discussed in the details of this history, where alone they can be understood.

‘Beyond, and besides the Reformation, the constitution of these islands now rests in large measure on foundations laid in this reign. Henry brought Ireland within the reach of English civilization. He absorbed Wales and the Palatinate into the general English system. He it was who raised the House of Commons from the narrow duty of voting supplies, and of passing without discussion the measures of the Privy Council, and converted them into the first power in the state under the crown.\* When he ascended the throne, so little did the Commons care for their privileges that their attendance at the sessions of Parliament was enforced by a law. They woke into life in 1529, and they became the right hand of the king to subdue the resistance of the House of Lords, and to force upon them a course of legislation which from their hearts they detested. Other kings in times of difficulty summoned their ‘great councils,’ composed of peers, or prelates

\* For this extraordinary statement Mr. Froude gives us no authority whatever; and we conceive it is contradicted impliedly by Hall, and most clearly by the event of this and subsequent reigns.

or municipal officials, or any persons whom they pleased to nominate. Henry VIII. broke through the ancient practice, and ever threw himself on the representatives of the people. By the Reformation, and by the power which he forced upon them, he had so interwoven the House of Commons with the highest business of the state, that the peers thenceforward sunk to be their shadow.

'Something, too, ought to be said of his individual exertions in the details of state administration. In his earlier life, though active and assiduous, he found leisure for elegant accomplishments, for splendid amusements, for relaxations, careless, extravagant, sometimes questionable. As his life drew onwards his lighter tastes disappeared, and the whole energy of his intellect was pressed into the business of the commonwealth. Those who have examined the printed state papers may form some impression of his industry from the documents which are his own composition, and the letters which he wrote and received; but only persons who have seen the original manuscripts, who have observed the traces of his pen in side notes and corrections, and the handwritings of his secretaries in diplomatic commissions, in drafts of Acts of Parliament, in expositions and formularies, in articles of faith, in proclamations, in the countless multitude of documents of all sorts, secular or ecclesiastical, which contain the real history of this extraordinary reign, only they can realize the extent of labour to which he sacrificed himself, and which brought his life to a premature close. His personal faults were great, and he shared, besides them, in the errors of his age; but far deeper blemishes would be but as scars upon the features of a sovereign who, in trying times, sustained nobly the honour of the English name, and carried the commonwealth securely through the hardest crisis in its history.'

Our quotations from this history, though rendered necessary to give an adequate idea of its beauty and power, have run to such a considerable length, that our closing observations must be somewhat brief. As regards its materials, its structure, and its style, it will always stand conspicuous as a model of historical composition. Mr. Froude has disdained the ignoble task of compiling his work from existing narratives; of 'running together,' as he expresses it, 'epitomes of Hume, or Lingard, or Sharon Turner, or Burnet;' he has had recourse to the mass of contemporaneous records which still exist with reference to his subject; and out of this huge 'palimpsest in which the original writing can still be read,' he has with immense labour, and most remarkable skill, constructed the volumes before us. No one, at all competent to form an opinion, will dispute that this is the true method of writing history; that if we wish to revive the features of the past, we should familiarize ourselves thoroughly with the aspect of them, as they appeared to the men and women of the time; and we must give our best thanks to Mr. Froude, in the interest of history, for having, with such thorough conscientiousness, fol-

this principle. To give life and form, however, to the materials of history is the privilege of genius, and our readers may form some opinion, from the extracts we have selected, of Mr. Froude's success in this respect; although a perfect judgment upon it can only be attained by a perusal of his entire work. After such a perusal we say at once that no English historian has so thoroughly exemplified the art of grouping events in their proper relations, of maintaining true historical proportion, and of presenting to the mind a complete and harmonious narrative. And, as regards the particular subject, no English historian has ever grouped and reproduced it in such clear and vigorous vitality. In these volumes we feel that the age of Henry VIII. is before us, not indeed restored to us with perfect accuracy, but still represented to us in a dramatic aspect in which its stirring events are placed in their proper order and subordination. How admirable is the delineation of the different feelings which animated the parties of England when the great shock and crisis of the Reformation broke up the long rest of the human intellect, and sent it forth on a career full of trouble, difficulty, and glory! How vividly we see again the vast heavings of that moral earthquake in which the elements of a great nation's life were wildly convulsed, and noble and ignoble natures coalesced into vast factions, sustained upon principles which, on either side, were worthy of a mighty conflict! How clear and perfect is the representation of the attitude of the Powers of Europe to each other in the long and dubious game which was played between them from 1529 to 1546; and how stirring and brilliant is the account of England's position throughout it! How profound, too, and accurate, are some of the reflections which pervade the narrative, and yet which are always relevant to it and explain it! Take the following passage upon the causes which petrify religion into formalism, as an example:—

'Had it been possible for mankind to sustain themselves upon this single principle without disguising its simplicity, their history would have been painted in far other colours than those which have so long chequered its surface. This, however, has not been given to us, and perhaps it never will be given. As the soul is clothed in flesh, and only thus is able to perform its functions on the earth, where it is sent to live; as the thought must find a word before it can pass from mind to mind; so every great truth seeks some body, some outward form in which to exhibit its powers. It appears in the world, and men lay hold of it, and represent it to themselves in histories, in forms of words, in sacramental symbols; and these things which, in their proper nature, are but illustrations, stiffen into essential fact, and become part of the reality. So arises in era after era an outward and

mortal expression of the inward immortal life; and at once the old struggle begins to repeat itself between the flesh and the spirit, the form and the reality. For awhile the lower tendencies are held in check. The meaning of the symbolism is living and fresh. It is a living language, vivid and suggestive. By-and-by, as the mind passes into other phases, the meaning is forgotten. The language becomes a dead language, and the living robe of life becomes a winding-sheet of corruption. The form is represented as everything, the spirit as nothing. Obedience is dispensed with. Sin and religion arrange a compromise; and outward observances and technical inward emotions are converted into juggler's tricks, by which men are enabled to enjoy their pleasures, and escape the penalties of wrong. Then such religion becomes no religion, but a falsehood; and honourable men turn away from it, and fall back in haste upon the naked elemental life.'

And take again this beautiful passage upon the gradual change in favour of toleration which has come over Christendom:—

- 'The three centuries which have passed over the world since the Reformation have soothed the theological animosities which they have failed to obliterate. An enlarged experience of one another has taught believers of all sorts that these differences need not be pressed into mortal hatred; and we have been led forward unconsciously into a recognition of a broader Christianity than as yet we are able to profess in the respectful acknowledgment of excellence wherever excellence is found. Where we see piety, continence, courage, self-forgetfulness, there, or not far off, we know is the spirit of the Almighty; and as we look around us among our living contemporaries, or look back with open eyes into the history of the past, we see—we dare not in voluntary blindness say we do not see—that God is no respecter of 'denominations' any more than He is a respecter of persons. His highest gifts are shed abroad with an even hand among the sects of Christendom, and petty distinctions melt away and become invisible in the palaces of a grander truth. Thus, even among those whose theories allow least room for latitude, liberty of conscience has become a law of modern thought. It is as if the ancient Catholic unity which was divided in the sixteenth century into separate streams of doctrine, as light is divided by the prism, was again imperceptibly returning; as if the coloured rays were once more blending themselves together in a purer and more rich transparency.'

The style of these passages of course speaks for itself; and indeed as regards that of all Mr. Froude's history, it is of the very highest order. Here and there marks of hastiness may be visible; here and there a sentence runs to great and unnecessary length, and is involved and contains repetitions; but as a whole the language is a beautiful model of ease, simplicity, harmony, and power.

And yet we must not be blind to the great faults of these volumes. We have already alluded to the want of study of con-

stitutional law which they betray, and here we shall only observe that this defect is as plain in the second as in the first part of the history. No notice is taken of the fact that the benevolence exacted by Henry in 1545 was directly in contravention of a statute of Richard III.; no attempt is made to estimate the changes in our polity which were the effect of the Reformation; and no opinion is given with regard to Tudor state trials and attainders, except a general assertion of their justice. These are serious errors undoubtedly; and yet perhaps the gravest error of this history is its disregard of moral considerations in narrating the events it has to deal with. Mr. Froude appears to arrange his drama as if an inevitable necessity compelled the actors in it to follow the lines of their conduct; and as if they were relieved of all moral responsibility, provided the ends they attained were great and advantageous. This is his method in portraying the characters of Henry VIII. and of Cromwell, and, however interesting and effective it makes such personages to the eye, it is surely an exemplification of the great falsehood that the end justifies the means employed. Under this conception any period of history must be placed in a false light, and it is a conception which in its extreme results, can only end in an idolatry of brute and unscrupulous force.

---

ART. II.—*Vetus et Novum Testamentum, ex antiquissimo Codice Vaticano.* Edidit ANGELUS MAIUS, S.R.E. Card. Romæ. Joseph Spithöver. 1857. 5 vols. 4to.

At last, this long-expected work, which has, for the last twenty years, sorely tried the patience of the Biblical scholars of Europe and America, has made its appearance. The Vatican codex—the queen of MSS.—to inspect which Bentley, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and many others, have made journeys to Rome—is no longer a sealed book, an unknown volume. Here are its whole contents, given to the world, and available to all who can afford to pay the goodly price at which the work is published.

As the title-page announces, the MS. is edited by Cardinal Mai, to whose laborious industry we are indebted for many other valuable works. Although but recently published, it has been long known that this edition of the Greek Scriptures has been printed some years. The cardinal showed Tischendorf the whole five volumes ready for publication in 1843. And from the work itself we learn that it was printed so far back as the year 1838. Various reasons have been suggested to explain this unaccount-

able delay. Dr. Tregelles says that when Rome was in the hands of the Republican government, and the authority of the Pope could no longer hinder the appearance of useful works, Cardinal Mai offered the impression for sale to Mr. Asher, the publisher at Berlin; but the terms named by the cardinal were deemed too high, and thus the negotiation came to nothing. The French occupation of Rome, and the restoration of the Papal government, soon prevented Cardinal Mai from publishing his edition; and thus Biblical scholars have been doomed to wait another ten years for this precious boon. Now that it is in our hands it is melancholy to reflect that the learned editor did not live to see the consummation of his labours, and that the work was finally sent forth to the world under the superintendence of another.

The work is well and handsomely got up. The type is very good, and the paper very stout, and capable of being written on. The text of the MS. is comprised in five stout quarto volumes, of which four contain the Old Testament, the fifth, the New. The Old Testament—the Septuagint translation—is of course valuable, having never before been correctly published; but the New Testament is, beyond all comparison, that which renders this work so especially important. On this account it is much to be regretted that the one cannot be separated from the other. The Old and New Testaments must be bought together. As the cost of the whole work is rather considerable—nine pounds—this is a serious matter to scholars, a race not usually burdened with wealth. It is true an edition of the New Testament alone, in smaller size, is announced as to follow hereafter, but the editor adds, some considerable time will probably first elapse.

It is well known that the Vatican codex, of which this edition is professedly a copy, has several deficiencies. In the New Testament it is entirely defective from Heb. ix. 14, to the end of the Apocalypse. This statement is likely to mislead, however, those who may not be aware of the order in which the various writings of the New Testament are placed in the most ancient copies—where the general epistles precede those of Paul. All that is really deficient then in this celebrated codex is—Heb. ix. 14, to the end, the pastoral epistles, and the Apocalypse. A recent scribe has added, in a cursive hand, what was defective of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and also the whole of the Apocalypse, but not the pastoral epistles. In the copy before us, the chasm in the Hebrews is supplied from an ancient MS. in the Vatican Library, of the tenth century, marked No. 1761. The pastoral epistles are given from the same codex. The Apocalypse exhibits the text of the celebrated Uncial MS. in the Vatican, No. 2066 (B. in the Apocalypse), belonging to the eighth century.

The Vatican codex thus at length given to the world—we need scarcely say—is generally regarded as the most ancient copy of the Greek Scriptures in existence. When it was deposited in that library? or Whence it was brought? are questions which none can answer. All we know is that early in the sixteenth century it was well known as an extremely ancient copy; but whether it came there as a present, or formed part of the spoils of the Greeks after the capture of Constantinople, it is impossible to decide.

By those who have seen the original MS., it is described as being of very thin vellum. The letters are small, regularly-formed uncials, without either accents or breathings as originally written; but these have been added by a later hand. The MS. is also entirely wanting in stops; the initial letters are of the same size as the rest. At each opening of the book six columns of writing are presented to the eye—three on each page. Critics insist much on these palæographic peculiarities as proofs of the extreme antiquity of the codex. Both Tischendorf and Tregelles ascribe its date to the middle of the fourth century. ‘How much older it may be,’ says the latter, ‘we have no means of determining.’

It must be obvious that the publication of a MS. of the Greek Testament, of such extraordinary age, must be of vast service in a critical point of view. But what enhances its value so greatly is the extreme difficulty, almost impossibility hitherto, of inspecting the MS. Such has been the narrow selfishness of the Papal court that all kinds of obstacles have been placed in the way of those who desired to examine its readings. Tischendorf, the indefatigable editor of the Critical Greek Testament, and of fac-simile editions of MSS., was only permitted to inspect a few select passages in the codex. Dr. Tregelles met with similar treatment. He visited Rome in 1845, principally for the purpose of collating the MS. for himself. During the five months which he spent there, he made great efforts to obtain permission to collate it, or at least to examine it in those places in which existing collations differ, but all ended in disappointment. He often saw the MS., but was not allowed to transcribe any of its readings. When we add that the collations hitherto made of the codex are so imperfect that they differ from each other in two thousand instances, it will be unnecessary to add anything further in proof of the exceeding importance of Cardinal Mai's publication.

But while we think the lamented editor has achieved a work which entitles him to the gratitude of the whole of Christendom, there are one or two points in which we are disposed to find fault with him. It appears that the text of this edition does not strictly follow that of the Vatican MS. In many instances where,



in the opinion of the learned cardinal, the transcriber had fallen into an error; or where the MS. from which he copied it, followed a reading not considered genuine, the passage is altered. Now we do protest against this uncritical mode of editing a document. If the text of a MS. is to be given to the world, let us have it, as it is found in the codex itself, with all its faults. We can then form a judgment on the subject for ourselves.

As examples of our meaning, we may mention that, in John i. 15, the Vatican MS. itself reads *ουτος ην ο ειπων*, but this the editor has altered into the common reading *ουτος ην ου ειπων*, placing the variation in the margin. In Matt. xxv. 22, the MS. omits *λαβων*, but the editor inserts the word in the text. A whole verse is wanting at Matt. xii. 47; it is supplied, however, in the present edition. The same remarks apply to the following passages:—Mark xv. 28; Luke xxii. 43, 44; Luke xxiii. 17 and 31; John v. 3, 4; 1 Peter v. 3. All these passages are omitted, whether by design or oversight we cannot determine, in the MS. itself, ~~but~~ they are printed in the text of this edition. Still more remarkable, the passage containing the account of the adulterous woman, John vii. 53—viii. 12, though absent from this ancient codex, appears here, as does also the famous clause of the three witnesses in 1 John v. 7. We cannot but think this is a great mistake. It is true the learned editor has in every case distinctly stated what the reading of the MS. really is; but the proper plan would have been to have made the text itself an exact representation of the Vatican copy. Why, too, has not Cardinal Mai supplied the other *lacune* of the MS.? To have been consistent with himself, Matt. xxiii. 14, and Acts xxiv. 7, 8, should have been supplied. If 1 John v. 7 is inserted, in favour of which not a single Greek MS. written before the sixteenth century can be quoted, surely the above passages ought not to be omitted.

Another and more serious charge which we have to bring against the editors of the work, is the want of that rigid accuracy which is so necessary in a publication of this kind. There is an impression prevalent amongst Biblical scholars that Cardinal Mai's edition does not faithfully represent the Vatican text; and it must be confessed, there is some ground for the belief. Not that any intentional departure from the reading of the MS. has been practised. On the contrary, the work contains abundant evidence that the cardinal has honestly endeavoured to give us a faithful copy of the Vatican text. He never makes the most trivial corrections without informing us what is the actual reading of the MS. But something more than good intentions is requisite in a publication of this nature. There can be no

question that the work has been performed throughout in a careless and unsatisfactory manner.

The grounds on which we have arrived at this conclusion are furnished by the preface of Vercellone, the editor, to whom the work was confided after the decease of Cardinal Mai. From this preface it appears that when the whole of the Old and New Testament was printed, Mai carefully revised the work from first to last. A person was employed to read to him the printed edition whilst he examined the MS. and noted down the errors. Years were spent in this work of revision, as the multiplicity of affairs in which the cardinal was occupied, allowed him only a few hours a week to devote to literary engagements. As the result of this examination we are informed that an *innumerable* amount of errors came to light—a fact which proves beyond all question the carelessness with which the work had been originally executed.

It now became a serious question how to remedy these innumerable errors. After giving his careful attention to the subject, Cardinal Mai decided on adopting a threefold plan. 1. He thought that certain mistakes might be corrected by erasing the superfluous letters, and supplying those that were deficient with a pen and ink. This was accordingly done by persons connected with the Vatican Library. But to avoid the danger of mistakes on the part of these correctors, it was resolved to add an index of these errata at the end of each volume. 2. There were many errors too bad to be corrected in this manner. Cardinal Mai determined to cancel the leaves containing such errors and print them afresh; but died before carrying out his plan. It was executed by his successor in the work from written instructions found after his decease. 3. Lastly, there remained more places in which the printed work differed in a slight degree from the MS. For example, in some cases slight typographical errors were found, a wrong letter, or accent, or other diacritical signs. In others the editor had omitted to distinguish what was *a prima* and *a secunda manu*, &c. Whilst again, in other cases, the peculiar orthography of the MS. had not been sufficiently attended to. As to all these errors of the third class, the present editor informs us he has at great labour corrected, in the lists of errata, the more important ones, leaving the remainder to be amended by the learned into whose hands the work may come.

Such are the candid admissions made by the present editor, as to the manner in which this most important work was executed. It cannot be denied that a great want of critical exactness has marked the publication, from first to last. It was printed in a slovenly manner; and then very inadequate means were employed

to remedy the numerous errors that came to light. The consequence is, it is impossible to regard the work as thoroughly trustworthy. One cannot resist the impression that mistakes are here and there still left uncorrected. Indeed Tischendorf has already pointed out five or six errors in the book.\* And in other places, where the published collations of the MS. all agree, the printed edition gives a different reading.

With the magnificent work lying before us, let us now briefly glance at some of the more remarkable readings of the codex.

In the song of the angels, in the fields of Bethlehem (Luke ii. 14), we observe it reads with the Alexandrian MS. and the Vulgate, *ευδοκίας*, i.e. 'peace on earth, to men of good will,' instead of 'on earth peace, good will to men,' as the common text has it. Here it is opposed to almost all the other authorities.

The common text in Mark iii. 29, is 'in danger of eternal condemnation;' but the Vatican, and a few kindred MSS. read *αιωνιον αμαρτηματος*, 'eternal offence,' or 'sin.'

In Luke vii. 54, the whole clause, *εβαλων εξω παντας και*, 'and he put them all out,' is omitted. This was no doubt a blunder of the scribe.

The Doxology in the Lord's Prayer (Matt. vi. 13), is wanting in the MS. So are also some clauses in the same form of prayer, in the other Evangelist (Luke xi. 2), where it reads as follows: 'O Father, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Give us day by day, our daily bread. And forgive us our sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And lead us not into temptation.'

The concluding verses of Mark's gospel (xvi. 9—20), it is well known, are wanting in the Vatican MS. But the editor states, what we were not previously aware of, that after the words *εφοβουντο γαρ*, verse 8, a whole page is left blank. He adds, truly, *hic est res notissima*. It proves unquestionably that the copyist knew of the additional paragraph, perhaps had it in his exemplar; but from some cause omitted to insert it.

A remarkable reading occurs John i. 18; a reading strongly confirmed by other ancient MSS. and versions. Instead of *μονογενης υιος*, the Vatican MS. has *μονογενης θεος*. The verse then reads as follows:—'No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten God, who dwelleth in the bosom of the Father, he hath revealed him.' As the two words are exceedingly similar when written in the contracted form usually adopted in the Uncial MSS. (ΥΣ and ΘΣ), the one might easily be mistaken for the other by a careless scribe. The reading of the Vatican

\* Novum Testam. Gr. Editio Sept. Lips. Funf. und Sechste Lieferung. 1858.

codex is also found in the Uncial MSS., C\* and L, as well as in the Peshito Syriac, and some other versions. A vast number of the early Fathers, too, are cited in support of the new reading. (See Tregelles, Printed Text of New Testament, p. 231.)

In the account of the impotent man, the whole of the disputed portion is wanting. The MS. commences the fifth verse, immediately after the words *τυφλων, χωλων, ξηρων* (John. v. 3). But the editor, according to his usual plan, has given the whole passage just as we have it in the common text; stating in a note the reading of the MS. itself.

The disputed passage of the adulterous woman, John vii. 53—viii. 12, is wholly wanting in this ancient MS., as it is also in many other first class codices and versions. But, since we have the express testimony of Augustine, that in the fourth century, it formed a part of the genuine text of John's gospel, it will require much stronger evidence than that of the Vatican MS. to convince us that it is an interpolation.

The 37th verse of Acts viii. is also absent here, but in this case a large majority of MSS. confirm the reading of the Vatican.

In the famous passage, Acts xx. 28, 'to feed the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood,' this ancient copy agrees with the common text, and the vast majority of cursive MSS. The other ancient uncials A, C and D, contain the reading 'church of the Lord' (*του κυριου*). It is well known that doubt has been cast on the reading of the Vatican MS. in this passage. It is satisfactory therefore to find that the testimony of Dr. Tregelles, who directed his attention particularly to this passage when at Rome, is confirmed by the printed text.

The only other reading of the Vatican text, which our space will allow us to notice, is the remarkable one found in 1 Peter iii. 15, where, instead of the common reading 'Sanctify the Lord God,' this copy reads 'Sanctify the Lord Christ' (*κυριον δε τον χριστον αγιασιτε*). This is one of the clearest testimonies to the Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ to be found in the whole New Testament. It occurs in a citation from Isaiah viii. 12, 13, in which the Apostle substitutes the above expression for the words 'Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself;' thus proving that in the New Testament the former is the equivalent of the latter in the Old. The reading *χριστον* is supported by overwhelming evidence; for it is found also in A, C, besides some cursive MSS., and in the Vulgate, the ancient Syriac, and several other ancient versions. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles adopt the corrected reading.

Such are some of the more remarkable passages in which this famous codex varies from the text in common use. It now remains to mention one or two characteristic features of the MS.

which the publication of its text will be the means of making generally known.

One thing which is very observable, in turning over the pages of this magnificent edition, is the vast number of mistakes which the original copyist has committed—that is to say, the very frequent substitution of one word for another, as the result of sheer carelessness. There is a notion very widely diffused amongst students of the Greek Testament that these most ancient MSS. of the sacred volume, so beautifully written in large uncial letters, are as much distinguished by their correctness as they are by their antiquity. The publication of the text of the famous Vatican codex is likely to scatter to the winds all such enthusiastic ideas, for we do not hesitate to say that the mistakes of the transcriber of this ancient MS. of the fourth century are quite as numerous as those found in the despised cursives of the twelfth and following centuries.

As indisputable instances of this alleged carelessness of the original writer we would refer to the following passages:—In Mark i. 24, the MS. reads *Τι ημιν και συ*; instead of *σου*. The editor directs attention to this error in a marginal note. In Mark xiii. 13, the word *τελος* is written *στελος*. This is an evident blunder, as no such word exists in the Greek language. Similarly the word *ημετερον* occurs, Luke xvi. 12, instead of *υμετερον*, making absolute nonsense of the passage.

The following strange syntax is found at Acts iv. 25, *Ο του πατρος ημων δια πνευματος αγιου στοματος Δαυειδ, κ.τ.λ.* None can suppose this a genuine reading; it is clearly the result of carelessness. In 1 Peter ii. 1, we find the word *φονους* for *φθονους*. This is also an evident blunder of the transcriber. The most strenuous advocate for antiquity could never suppose that the Apostle Peter here enjoins the saints to 'lay aside murders,' since it would imply that at that period they practised them. An equally gross blunder occurs 2 Peter ii. 13, where the MS. reads—*Αδικουμενοι μισθον αδικιας*, 'suffering unjustly as to the reward of iniquity,' instead of *κομιουμενοι μισθον αδικιας*, 'receiving the reward of iniquity.' Another mistake occurs in the same verse—*αγαπαις* for *απαταις*, a reading which it is impossible to defend.

The same remark applies to John's third epistle, verse 3, where we find *μαρτυρουν* for *μαρτυρουντων*. The scribe laid down his pen on writing the first *ν*, and on resuming it forgot to finish the word. A most singular arrangement of words occurs at 1 Cor. i. 2. After *Θεου* follow, *ηγιασμενοις εν Χριστω Ιησου, τη ουση εν Κορινθω, κλητοις αγιοις, κ.τ.λ.* At Philip. ii. 1, is another mistake, *ει τις σπλαγχνα* for *ει τινα σπλαγχνα*. Another singular error occurs at Rom. xiv. 18, where the MS. reads—*δοκιμοις τοις*

ανθρωποις, instead of δοκιμος, κτ.λ. In Jude, also, at verse 21, we find the word τηρησωμεν for τηρησατε. Both these variations evidently arose from carelessness on the part of the copyist, since they make nonsense of the passages where they occur.

One more instance is deserving of notice, on account of its bearing upon the famous passage, Rom. v. 1. At Gal. vi. 10, the Vatican codex reads εχωμεν instead of εχομεν. In this case the variation is clearly a blunder of the copyist, since no other MS., so far as we are aware, agrees with it. Too much stress, therefore, should not be laid on the reading of the Vatican in the other case.

But the most numerous class of blunders with which we have met are those arising from the interchange of the personal pronouns. For example, at 2 Cor. i. 6, we read η ελπις υμων instead of . . . ημων. Again, at verse 21, υμας is found in two places for ημας. In the fifth chapter (v. 12), we find ημιν for υμιν, and so on throughout the copy. It should be added that in all the instances of mistakes which we have noticed, as well as in those that follow, there is no room to question the correctness of the printed text, as the editor expressly assures us that he has in those places faithfully copied the *Codex Vaticanus*.

Notwithstanding the numerous errors we have already referred to, the omissions of the copyist still remain to be noticed; and this fault, of passing by what should be inserted, is undoubtedly the characteristic feature of this ancient MS. In many of these instances the scribe has accidentally left out a word or clause, and then added it in the margin, or placed it between the lines, right over its place in the text. For example, he has omitted την γυναικα at Mark vi. 17, but afterwards added it in the margin. At Mark x. 29, the first ενεκεν is left out before μου, and added in the margin. The same remark applies to ουδεν in Mark xv. 4. In Luke xix. 25, the word κυριε was originally overlooked, but it is inserted over the other words by the same hand. Two omissions of similar kind are found in the first chapter of John's gospel. The words των ανθρωπων are omitted in verse 4, and the clause ουδε εκ θεληματος ανδρος in verse 13. Both mistakes are corrected, apparently by the original writer, in the margin. Several other omissions of the same nature occur in this gospel; as of το πνευμα in chap. iii. 34; παλιν in chap. iv. 3. In each instance the deficient word is inserted in the margin *a primâ manu*.

Now in all these examples nothing can be plainer than that the transcriber of the Vatican codex accidentally, and by oversight, omitted to insert the words in question; and then, either discovered his error at the time, or else on reading through the MS. observed the deficiencies. In some cases half a verse is thus left out, and afterwards supplied in the margin, as at Acts xxiii. 28,

where six words are wanting in the text, and afterwards added ; —viz., *κατηγαγον αυτον εις το συνεδριον αυτων*.

But there is another large class of passages in which words or clauses are omitted without being afterwards supplied ; and yet the context shows that the deficiency has arisen from oversight and carelessness. None can question that the missing words originally formed a part of the sacred text. As indubitable instances we select the following from our list :—In Matt. xii., the 47th verse is entirely omitted, although the passage is absolutely essential to what follows. In chap. xix., *αυτου* is omitted in verse 10, and *τουτου* in verse 11, contrary to all other Vocal MSS. In chap. xx. 21, the word *σου* is omitted where all other MSS., according to Tregelles, insert it. A more striking instance occurs in Matt. xxv. 22, where the word *λαβων* is wanting, although the words governed by it *τα ταλαντα* are inserted. There can be no doubt it was in the original copy.

Passing by several less decisive instances, we may mention that in 1 Peter v. 3, the whole of the verse is wanting ; and in 1 Cor. iv. 6, the word *φρονειν* ; although in this latter case the sense is incomplete as the text stands. Similarly in Ephes. i. 15, *αγαπην* is omitted, although the article belonging to it is there. In Col. ii. 2, an extraordinary reading, *του Θεου Χριστου*, 'of the God Christ,' is occasioned entirely by omitting the words *και πατρος και του* after *Θεου*. To mention no more : *η επιστολη* are left out at Col. iv. 16 ; *τας αμαρτιας* at 1 Thes. ii. 16 ; and *και νομου* in Heb. vii. 12. In all three examples the context proves unquestionably that the words were originally in the respective passages.

The numerous omissions which disfigure the Vatican MS. are certainly proofs of carelessness on the part of the transcriber. Still, all who are acquainted with the peculiar mode in which MSS. were written at the period to which this is assigned, will be disposed to make every allowance for blunders of this sort. For the words ran one into another without either space between, stops, or anything else to divide them. Hence, nothing was easier than for the scribe on finishing one word or line, to look at the wrong place on lifting up his eye, and thus omit one or more words, or even a whole verse.

Such are some of the more striking peculiarities of the Vatican MS., which a careful examination of Cardinal Mai's edition has brought under our notice. We have mentioned several of the more important readings of the codex, especially such as appeared of dogmatical consequence. We have also noticed some of the chief faults which disfigure this ancient document. In spite of these defects there can be no question that the MS. is of great

value to the Biblical student. We venture to predict, too, that its publication will exercise an immense influence on a subject of growing importance in the present day—the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.

When we reflect on the immense importance of possessing the *ipsissima verba* of Divine revelation, it is a circumstance much to be regretted, that in the middle of the nineteenth century the text of the Greek Testament should still remain unsettled. It is true we have several critical editions of that inspired volume; some of which are the results of vast research, indefatigable labour, and great ability. But the misfortune is, that instead of substantially, at least, agreeing, the texts which they present are in very many passages altogether at variance. In fact each successive editor of the Greek Testament, hitherto, has overthrown the theory of his predecessor and then erected his own system upon the ruins. Griesbach displaced the text in common use. Scholz overturned that of Griesbach. Lachmann afterwards superseded Scholz; and Tischendorf now ranks far above Lachmann. Under these circumstances of continual fluctuation, the sincere student of God's Holy Word feels no small difficulty in choosing a text.

The text of the Greek Testament in common use is that of the Elzevirs, and also, substantially, that of Mills. It was first published in 1624. This edition was long regarded as the *ne plus ultra* of a correct text. For nearly a century it enjoyed a reputation of which there are few parallels. It was republished in 1633, and announced as 'a text received by all;' language which though denoting merely that it was a text to which theologians of all parties were content to appeal, gradually came to be accepted as a testimony to the value of the text.

From this extravagant admiration of the received text of the New Testament, scholars passed, as is commonly the case, to the contrary extreme. It is become the fashion with a certain class of critics to decry the *Textus Receptus* as altogether worthless. The materials in the possession of the editors, we are told, 'were scanty,' and 'of inferior value.' The editors did not make the best use of them; 'nor understand their character and value.' As a natural consequence of such opinions, the critical editions of the Greek Testament most in favour now-a-days, follow a text which differs considerably from that in common use.

Now we think, that with most unbiassed and dispassionate men, it will be felt that truth, in all probability, lies between the two extremes. It is allowed that the text, on which our authorized version is substantially based, cannot lay claim to the praise of being immaculate, but still it is not chargeable with those



numerous and gross corruptions which Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf allege.

We strongly suspect that in their eagerness to extol the critical texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, scholars have unduly depreciated the merits of Erasmus, the father of the present *Textus Receptus*. Certainly his materials were not so few, nor so modern, as some writers represent. In preparing his first edition he possessed a MS. of the tenth century, containing the whole New Testament, except the Revelation; a MS. of the Gospels written at a later date; another containing the Acts and Epistles, of which the date is unknown. Besides these he used a MS. of the Revelation, the Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae, and as Hug informs us, two other MSS.\* He collated also some Latin MSS., and the principal writings of the Fathers.

Much stress has been laid on the hurried manner in which Erasmus completed this first edition. But it should be remembered; that our common text does not spring from that, but from a long subsequent edition. Eighteen years intervened between the first and last editions which Erasmus superintended, during which he enjoyed abundant opportunities of amending the text. If we are to credit his own assertions, he had acquired additional materials for revising his former editions. In the preface to the fifth and last edition, published in 1535, he says he had collated 'not a few most ancient and most correct MSS.'

It must not be forgotten too, that the very same year that Erasmus published his third edition, the celebrated Bible of Alcalá, better known as the *Complutensian Polyglot*, was given to the world. The editors of this superb work employed 'most ancient and most correct MSS.,' sent from the Vatican Library, in editing the Greek Testament. Erasmus examined the Complutensian text for both his two last editions. He thus possessed the results of the collation of the Vatican MSS. in addition to those which he had himself examined. Critics are scarcely justified then, we think, in representing the sources of the text of Erasmus as 'a few MSS. of inferior value.'

Robert Stephens, a learned bookseller of Paris, was the next individual who contributed to the formation of the text in common use. His first edition appeared in the year 1546. In the preface Stephens states that he had 'obtained from the king's library several MSS., which, from their apparent antiquity, almost deserved to be worshipped;' and that he had 'formed his edition from them, in such a manner as not to print even a single letter that was not confirmed by the greater and better part of them.'

\* Introd. to New Test. Vol. i. p. 304.

He goes on to say, 'we have employed others also,' besides the 'Complutensian edition which the Spanish Cardinal Ximenes 'published from the most ancient MSS. of the Pope's library; 'with which and ours we have found very frequently by actual 'collation, an extraordinary agreement subsisting.' Two subsequent editions followed in the course of the next three or four years. In the third edition, that from which our received text is derived, Stephens followed the fifth edition of Erasmus, in conjunction with the Complutensian Polyglot; collating at the same time fifteen MSS., whose variations were placed in the margin.

It would thus appear that the materials possessed by the authors of the common text of the Greek Testament were not so scanty or worthless as is commonly alleged. But more remains behind. Theodore Beza, the illustrious Reformer, published altogether five editions of the Greek Testament; the last appearing thirty-three years after the first. It is allowed on 'all hands' that besides his superiority as a critic, Beza possessed far more important materials for the formation of a correct text than Stephens, whose third edition he made the basis of his own. In particular he had a printed Greek Testament in which were entered the readings of fifteen MSS. originally collated by Stephens's son, Henry, for his father's use. These MSS., so far as they can be ascertained at this distance of time, were of respectable age. There was one MS. of the eighth or ninth century (L of Griesbach); one of the tenth; four of the eleventh; three of the twelfth; and, lastly, the celebrated codex D, so much valued by recent editors. Such were the sources of emendation possessed by Beza for his *first* edition. Before his *second* appeared he had obtained farther and yet more important materials; including the Syriac version called the Peshito; the celebrated *Codex Claromontanus* (I of the Pauline epistles) and the codex D of the gospels; of which he already possessed the collation of Stephens.

On a careful review of the various steps by which, as we have seen, the text in common use was formed, we are strongly disposed to think that much of the contempt which modern critics have expressed for the common Stephanic and Elzevir text of the Greek Testament, is unmerited and unjust. It is true the original editors of that precious volume could not boast of the ample materials for emendation which Wetstein and Griesbach, Scholz and Matthei, Lachmann and Tischendorf possessed, but taken as a whole, their authorities were by no means to be despised.

Nor should it be forgotten that whilst the *number* of witnesses

which we can boast. The practice of rejecting the testimony of the whole mass of later MSS. appears, then, to be unwarranted by the actual state of the case.

To this argument against the exclusive authority of the very early MSS. it has been objected that, 'if there were any force in the remark, it would apply quite as much to a vast number of the modern codices.' But, in the case of these modern copies of the Greek Testament, it is by no means so necessary that we should know the transcribers by whom they were executed as in that of ancient MSS. The reason why this knowledge is so essential in regard to the copies of the fourth or fifth centuries, is in order that we may possess some security that they represent the text of the age in which they were transcribed. As only four or five MSS. of the first six centuries have descended to our time, out of many thousands, thinking men, uninfluenced by the mere love of antiquity, naturally require some *proof* of the integrity of these copies of the Word of God, before they surrender themselves so implicitly to their guidance; some guarantee, in short, that none of these favourite uncials, A, B, C, and D are either *faulty* copies, which had been laid aside on the ground of their numerous errata, or, on the other hand, *falsified* copies written for the use of some heretical sect. But all such apprehensions are quite out of the question with regard to the great mass of modern codices. No one can for one moment doubt that they represent, as a whole, the genuine text of the Greek Testament. For, in the first place, they exist in too great numbers to admit of the suspicion that they are imperfect or corrupted copies. Secondly, they possess, in a vast number of cases, marks of various kinds, serving to show, in some instances, who wrote them; in others, the purposes for which they were written. It thus appears that, whilst it is by no means important that we should know anything respecting the origin, history, or character of the more modern copies, we do really know a great deal about them!

We must add one further remark, on the probable influence of the publication before us, on the subject of textual criticism. The numerous *omissions* of the Vatican Codex—now for the first time published to the world—can hardly fail to make critics more cautious how they expunge clauses from the text of the Greek Testament on the ground that they are wanting in that ancient copy. It is worthy of notice, that by far the largest number of variations introduced of late years into the text of the New Testament consists of *omissions*; and, in most cases, it will be found that the chief authority for such omissions is the celebrated *Codex Vaticanus*. Now, when the peculiar character of this MS. is taken into account—that of continually omitting portions

of the real text of Scripture—it must be acknowledged that critics are here at fault. It is true the codex B is an ancient MS., probably the most ancient MS. of the Greek Testament in existence. But then there is the fact, the incontestible fact, that the copyist, whoever he was, has repeatedly left out words, clauses, even whole verses occasionally, by sheer carelessness, which is proved from two things—first, that the omissions are found in all other MSS. and versions that have been examined; and, secondly, that the passages from which these portions have dropped cannot be translated or understood without them. All *omissions*, therefore, in the Vatican MS. should be regarded with the greatest suspicion. The absence of any portion of the received text from this ancient codex should never be made the ground of rejecting such passage, because it was the known tendency of the copyist to overlook what was really before him.

If our remarks are founded in truth, it is evident that the critical texts which have lately been published will have to undergo a severe revision; they will have to be brought in all probability much nearer to the common text than is the case at present. For not only do we find whole clauses continually omitted by Tischendorf and Tregelles, *chiefly* on account of their absence from the Vatican copy, but in many cases this is done *almost entirely* on that ground.

We will give a few examples of this, taken exclusively from the first gospel. At Matt. i. 25 the received text has ‘till she had brought forth *her first-born son.*’ But the critical texts of Tischendorf and Tregelles read ‘a son,’ omitting the words ‘*αυτης*’ and ‘*πρωτοτοκον.*’ If we inquire on what authority these words are left out, we shall find that it is because the Vatican omits them: for only one *Codex Rescriptus* (Z) supports the new reading; whilst about a dozen Uncials contain the omitted words (C, D<sup>s</sup>, L, Δ, E, K, &c.) and Cursives without number. The testimony of the versions on the same side is also overwhelming.

In Matt. v. Tischendorf and Tregelles omit more than half of the 44th verse—viz., the two clauses, ‘Bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you;’ ‘and them which despitefully use you.’ On what ground are these clauses expunged? So far as MS. authority goes, the Vatican MS. is the only Uncial that omits them. The versions, too, are decidedly in favour of the common reading. Here the critical texts are altogether incorrect.

A similar instance occurs in Matt. xviii. where a whole verse (v. 11) is omitted by Tischendorf and Tregelles, almost exclusively on the ground of its being absent from the Vatican Codex. The words are, ‘For the Son of man is come to save that which

was lost.' The only MSS. cited in support of this omission are the Uncial L and two Cursives which commonly agree with it 1, 33. Whilst the MSS. containing it comprise all others that are known : D, IJ, X, Δ, E, F, G, H, &c. The Latin versions, too, both the ancient and the Vulgate, contain the verse ; as do also the Peshito, the Ethiopic, the Armenian, &c.

Once more, at Matt. xx. 16, the clause 'For many are called but few are chosen,' is omitted in some editions by Tischendorf, and placed within brackets by Tregelles. Now, the clause is wanting, it is true, in the Vatican, and in two Uncials Z and L ; but, with these exceptions, it is found in all the more ancient MSS. : C, D, N, I, X, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V. It is also in the ancient Peshito and Latin versions, the Vulgate, Armenian, and Ethiopic, &c. Our space will not allow of our entering into other passages, but we would refer the critical reader especially to Matt. xxii. 13, xxii. 30, and xxviii. 9, as presenting instances precisely of the same nature as those just quoted.

In our earlier days we paid great deference to the maxim, *Unique professori suâ in arte credendum* ; but we have lived long enough to learn that, like all other general propositions, it has its limitations. Professors, like individuals, are apt to come under the dominion of some fixed idea. By concentrating the mind on one object, you impair its capacity of judging of the importance of that object in relation to others. It is thus with certain of our textual critics. They have spent so much of their time in searching for old MSS., and deciphering illegible codices, that they almost worship those relics of the past. Heedless of the innumerable blunders which disfigure the most valued of these ancient copies, the fact that more than one of their favourite MSS. agree in a reading often suffices to establish that as the genuine text. There may be a dozen other Uncials against the reading ; there may be twice the number of ancient versions against the reading that are found with it, and hundreds of Cursive MSS. also, many of which, in all probability, were copied from codices as old or older than any in existence. It matters not. *Causa finita est.*

- ART. III.—(1.) *Histoire des Livres Populaires, et de la Littérature du Colportage, depuis le XV. Siècle jusqu'à 1852.* Par M. CHARLES NISARD. 2 tomes. Paris. 1854.
- (2.) *A Prognostication of Right Good Effect.* By LEONARD DIGGES. London. 1555.
- (3.) *The Almanacs from 1607 to 1616.*
- (4.) *Almanacs for the Year 1630.*
- (5.) *Merlinus Anglicus.* By WILLIAM LILLY. 1644 to 1660.

TRULY has a late French writer remarked, that the most ancient books, excepting the Bible, are perhaps almanacs. And a lengthened existence seems still to be promised to these little interpreters of the future, for amid all the changes of society, all the marvels of later years, the almanac still courts our notice as the new year draws nigh. Much has been changed since the times of our forefathers. Our streets are lighted with gas, the steamboat and rail whirl us along, the sun paints our pictures for us, the electric spark carries our messages, and that latest, and most wonderful achievement, the Atlantic Telegraph, gives promise of fulfilling tricky Puck's boast, to

‘Put a girdle round about the earth  
In forty minutes.’

But still each year the almanac is sought after, even as in the days of our great-grandfathers; and, ere the close of this month, some half dozen ‘weather almanacs’—each the only correct one—will make their appearance, pointing out every variation of our most variable climate; and ‘Zadkiel’ will foretell the fate of our eastern empire, and decipher by aid of the stars that new riddle of the Sphinx, Cherbourg; and old *Fox Stellarum*—how ‘fallen from his high estate,’ as the ‘leading almanac,’ to the mere penny puffer of Parr’s Life Pills—will still be sought for, and read by thousands, who will seek to make out its unintelligible hieroglyphic with a faith little less implicit than that of their fathers in those palmy days of almanacs and almanac-makers, when the statesman pored over the horoscope, and astrologers waited in the ante-chambers of sovereigns.

Very amusing, as well as suggestive, is the history of kalendars and almanacs. Among the earliest illuminated manuscripts we find the kalendar; and coeval with the earliest printed books, the almanac claims a place. Throughout all Christian Europe the same hands that brought the missal, or the book of the Gospels, brought the kalendar also, and thus we find it prefixed to our most ancient church books. The very earliest Saxon manuscripts

exhibit it with little ornament beyond flourishes in red and blue ink—Christmas day or Easter sometimes with the additional honour of gold letters. King Athelstan's Psalter—believed, however, to have been written long before his time, as early as 703—includes, in addition to the kalendar, lunar tables, and these are of frequent occurrence in subsequent manuscripts. Those indispensable adjuncts to the later kalendars, the signs of the zodiac, are not to be met with as yet; but rude representations of the various agricultural labours of the year will be found in many Saxon kalendars, and in one a pleasant picture of Christmas festivities. The inquirer who would seek to enter the very homes of our forefathers, and learn how they worked, and how they feasted, how comfortably they sat over their blazing log fire in January, how toilsomely they delved and ploughed in March, how pleasantly in May they disported themselves in the green meadows, how in August they gathered the harvest, and in September the apples, or the vintage, owes no small tribute of gratitude to the illuminators of the ancient kalendar, more especially those from the eleventh to the fourteenth century.

It is a question whether these mediæval kalendars ever existed in a separate form. Prefixed to the missal, or the book of the Gospels, their use was obvious, for they supplied the long, almost interminable list of saints' days, and the rules, too, whereby the moveable feasts might be determined, while as yet almanacs were not; but save for the churchman and church-goer, the earlier kalendars offered little information that could be of use. Some of the later, however, so much resemble, in their miscellaneous information, their successors, the almanacs, that M. Louis Moland, who has directed particular attention to this question in his essay on *Les Calendriers avant l'imprimerie*, thinks that some must certainly have existed in a separate form, although none of these are now in existence. As illustrating the history of art, these kalendars are often more valuable than the books to which they form an introduction. It is frequently only from some specific entry, or some date in these, that the age of the manuscript, or name of the owner can be ascertained. Thus the splendid Prayer Book of Charles the Bold is verified by the entry of the baptism of his eldest son; and thus the beautiful ivory-bound missal in the Egerton Collection (No. 1139) is proved to have belonged to Melisenda, the fair and energetic queen of Jerusalem, from the notice of the death of her father, Baldwin II., as well as that of her mother, being inserted in the kalendar. In many kalendars the locality may be ascertained by reference to the illuminations which head the various months. The vintage scene will afford proof that the manuscript is French, while the

mercy apple-gathering, with the laughing maidens, light haired and rosy-checked, will prove with almost equal certainty that the illuminator was an Englishman. In the French kalendars, reaping is the occupation of July; in the English, of August. In November and December, the French kalendars mostly represent the killing of cattle for the winter provision; the English, with better taste, depict the threshing-floor, or the Christmas festivity. We may here remark how very pleasant a subject pig-killing appears to have been to the Flemish illuminator. We have looked over well-nigh a score of Flemish kalendars, and invariably found the month of November or December illustrated by a huge pig, sometimes two, hung up, and men, with most murderous-looking knives, preparing to cut their throats. In that exquisite volume, the proudest boast of the Flemish illuminators, Anne of Brittany's missal, the gift-book of the twice-crowned queen of France, the reader would scarcely believe that so revolting, as well as homely a subject would find a place; but there, finished with the delicate minuteness of a Teniers, is a fat pig, hung up to a stout staple by its hind legs, its throat just cut by a very complacent-looking butcher, while a neat-handed Flemish damsel, with coif and apron white as snow, is gleefully holding a huge earthen dish, evidently indulging in pleasant anticipations of future black-puddings. What a dainty picture 'to set before a queen!' and how illustrative of that coarseness of taste which has characterized the Flemish school through every period of its artistic history. Very different are the Italian illustrations of the kalendar. Delicate wreaths of flowers, arabesque borders enclosing the signs of the zodiac, each sign sometimes exquisitely painted in natural colours on a raised gold ground, sometimes like cameos, and in such fine relief that we almost involuntarily touch them, and are surprised to find that they are not raised. Sometimes, in addition to the sign a single figure, engaged in the occupation of the month, is placed beside. These are exquisitely finished in the missal of King René—a beautiful volume, which, although executed in France, is unquestionably Italian in its character: and in this, each page of the kalendar has in addition a beautiful little bird perched at the top—the nightingale representing May, while robin redbreast ushers in December.

While much information, as we have seen, may be derived from the pictorial illustrations of these kalendars, they likewise supply to us many curious illustrations of the superstitious and popular opinions of our forefathers in the tables of fortunate and unfortunate days, the dietetic rules and the miscellaneous remarks, which from about the middle of the thirteenth century, they

•



mostly contain. There are, of course, no predictions in these kalendars; and the readers therefore—save here and there some learned churchman who stealthily cultivated astrology—were left in happy ignorance from year to year, whether ‘doleful Saturn’ was diffusing his baleful influences, or whether ‘fiery Mars’ was about to deluge the land with bloodshed. Our forefathers in the middle ages, however, had notwithstanding little cause to rejoice, for in dread array the ‘unlucky days’ were set forth, duly noted in many kalendars by a red cross being placed against each, like the plague-stricken houses of later times. Two unfortunate days are in every instance, except April and December, assigned to each month in the French kalendars, while April claims only one, the 30th; but December three. It is difficult, perhaps impossible, to ascertain the rules that guided the mediæval astrologer in this selection. April 30th, consecrated, so to speak, to witchcraft and devilry, as the Walpurgis Eve, might well take its place in the list of unlucky days; but why the 20th of July, the day on which St. Margaret was celebrated throughout Christendom, the 1st of August, Lammas Day, September 21st, consecrated to St. Matthew, and, stranger still, the day before Christmas Eve, and New Year’s Day, all seasons in which the church held high festival, should be marked with the portentous red cross, seems utterly inexplicable. As the list from which we have quoted is common to the kalendars of the south of France and Lombardy, we can almost suspect that some wily Jew, or heretical churchman, and there were no lack of the latter in the thirteenth century, took a malicious pleasure in marking as unfortunate, days on which holy church had commanded her children to rejoice, and seeing them take possession of their ‘Lammas land’ with fear and trembling, and join in the New Year’s feasting with feelings better suited to a fast. We were happy, however, to find, that, as in most other subjects, there was some difference of opinion as to unlucky days; the English list varying greatly from the French, so that we doubt not but if a general collation of mediæval kalendars could be made, we should discover that each day marked as unfortunate in one, would be found a ‘lucky day’ in another.\*

To good or bad luck, as concerns the days of the week, these kalendars make no reference, save to Friday, and this most unfor-

\* As fortunate and unfortunate are words of wide import, the reader may perhaps like to know what the kalendar-makers themselves intended by their use. M. Louis Moland, therefore, gives us the following explanation from a kalendar of the fourteenth century:—‘Those who fall ill on unlucky days will be in danger; those who are born then will either die or grow up to be poor. If a man marries, either he or his wife will not live long, or they will not love, or will be always poor; and those who travel will return either not in good health, or poor and disappointed.’

fortune of days is proved to deserve its evil name for thirteen reasons, all of which are duly set forth. Some of these are anything but conclusive, for, although the first reason that 'on this day Cain killed Abel,' may be fairly allowed, still the second, that, 'on this day the children of Israel entered the Promised Land,' cannot be so. That on 'this day' the Annunciation took place, seems a strange reason for a fast, although the massacre of the Innocents, and the beheading of St. John the Baptist, both of which, we are told, took place on this day, may be considered so. However, that Friday was the black day of the week, was the belief of all mediæval Europe, a belief so deeply inwrought, that even in the nineteenth century, and among those who have never heard of these thirteen reasons, it is still regarded, even by our own peasantry, with a feeling of mysterious dislike.

In some of these kalendars, there are astronomical tables, illustrated by carefully drawn, and sometimes beautifully finished illuminations. The Antiphonal (Arundel Collection, No. 83), has a very well executed orrery: the sun in the middle, with flaming face, inscribed according to ecclesiastical opinion, *infernus*, and beyond him all the planets from Mercury to distant Saturn, moving round in their courses. In another, in the Sloane Collection, are very graceful representations of each planet with its appropriate attributes. In some of these kalendars are prognostications respecting the weather; and among them many sayings will be found, in rude rhymes, French or English, which still keep their place in the popular mind. The well-known distich—

' Evening red and morning grey  
Is the sign of a fine day,'

we found in a kalendar of the fifteenth century, and the equally well-known rhyme of the 'rainbow in the morning,' is also frequently to be found in them. Similar rhymes are common in the French kalendars, which also occasionally preserve short satirical remarks on various subjects, mostly national or provincial traits, often curious and characteristic enough. Here is one taken from a kalendar of the thirteenth century:—

Pitié de Lombard, travail de Picard,  
Humilité de Normand, patience d'Allemand,  
Largesse de Français, loiauté d'Anglais,  
Devotion de Bourguignon, sens de Breton,  
Ces huit choses, ne valent un bouchon.'

It is suggestive to observe here, how the pride of the Norman and the stupidity of the Breton, are recognised as their characteristics full six hundred years ago. For the hard-heartedness

assigned to the Lombard, we may find the reason in the fact that during this and the following century they were the great money-lenders of Europe; and succeeding to the profession and emoluments of the hated Jew, the Lombard succeeded also to his inheritance of scorn and detestation. The disloyalty of the Englishman, too, was apparent enough to the writer of that age, for had he not seen the barons arrayed against their liege lord, and forcing him to submit? and his son, perhaps at the very time when these rude rhymes were composed, at strife with De Montfort, or a fugitive in France supplicating aid from his good brother and ally, St. Louis? The separate notice of 'the Frenchman' appears strange, until we call to mind that at this period a very small portion of modern France was France proper. As the term 'Français' was frequently used to signify the Parisian of those days, may we not detect some recognition of the *épiciér* character, even thus early, in the charge of miserliness brought against him?

But however varied in regard to general information these kalendars may be, they almost always contain a short directory of medical and dietetic advice. These directories, while similar in their general outline, all agreeing in their recommendations of most nauseous herb-teas, and peremptory in their directions for bleeding both at spring and fall, besides one or two supplementary blood-lettings against Christmas, exhibit occasional differences, sufficient to show that the learned doctors of Salerno, and the even more learned leech who had studied eastern lore at Salamanca, could not always agree. Still the absolute necessity of frequent bleeding and continual physickings, is insisted upon in all; as the reader will find from the following ample directory, copied by M. Louis Moland from a manuscript of the thirteenth century in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal.

'In January it is not good to bleed, but you should take ginger as medicine. In February it is good to bleed in the arm, and take agrimony as medicine. In March we should drink sweet drinks, and take rue as medicine. We must not, however, be bled; but may be cupped. In April it is good to bleed the middle vein to cleanse the lungs, and to eat fresh meat, and to be cupped, and take betony as medicine. In May we ought to eat hot things, and drink hot things, and bleed the liver vein, which is then full of venom (venim). Avoid eating the feet or head of any beast, for such meat is injurious to health. It is good to take medicine of wormwood and fennel-seed. In June it is good to take cold water every day fasting, and to eat lettuce and garlic: to abstain from excess, for the humours now rise to the brain. It is good to take sage and grape-flowers. For July the same. In August, drink neither ippocras nor beer, but take medicine of sage. In September, it is proper to eat the flesh of geese and pigs, because of

their 'viscosity,' and take betony as medicine. It is good to draw a little blood, both at the beginning and end of the month. In October we ought to eat grapes, and drink sweet wine, and goat's-milk, or ewe's, every day fasting. Then take medicine of cloves and sage, to protect against paralysis. It is good to bleed this month. In November, it is good to bleed the liver-vein, and avoid eating the head and feet of beasts, which are then unwholesome. In this month we should not bathe, but we may use vapour baths and take medicine of hyssop. In December do the same.'

From the homely character of much of the information contained in the later kalendars, as well as from their being in the vernacular tongue, we should think it not unlikely that, in the flourishing towns of England, France, and Flanders, most of the 'substantial' burghers possessed a kalendar: and, doubtless, in most cases, it was prefixed to the Prayer Book. We are very apt to underrate the extent of manuscript literature during the middle ages, and to forget, that while the illuminated volume might take many months—often years—for its completion, the merely written book could be executed in a very short time, and by the hands of very inferior copyists. That there were large numbers of these, wholly dependent on the gains of mere copying, we have proof in the complaints which followed the discovery of printing, when the plea that it would deprive hundreds of bread was so successfully urged, that the early printer was fain to flee from city to city, and only by stealth practise his art.

Some of the earliest printed books—if three or four leaves may be called so,—are kalendars. There are fragments of some of these, German ones, in the British Museum—one, we recollect, dates as early as 1474,—and in the continental libraries, some of an earlier date will be found. The period at which the transition from the kalendar to the almanac took place, cannot be ascertained; it was doubtless early in the sixteenth century: for, before its close, the almanac had become an absolute necessity, not only to the middle classes, but even to 'uplandish men,' who, in our early drama, are often represented as poring over the almanac to learn the age of the moon, or the changes of the weather. On the Continent, the eagerness for almanacs was as great; and among the French almanacs still published and still widely circulated, is one which claims an antiquity of more than three hundred and fifty years. This Nestor of almanacs, which bears the name of *Le Grand Compost, et Calendrier des Bergers*, has been very minutely described by M. Nisard, in his interesting work on the *colporteur* literature of France.

But venerable, from its antiquity, as *Le Grand Compost* undoubtedly is, we are inclined to assign a still higher antiquity to

a most curious little volume, which bears the title of *Le Nouveau Calendrier des Bergers*, and which, by means of strange hieroglyphical signs, supplies the unlettered peasant of the South of France with directions for each day throughout the year. M. Nisard has inserted two pages of this little book, just as it was printed in the year 1852! and a stranger specimen of an almanac of the nineteenth century, could not possibly meet the eye. At the top of a very small page, three most frightful resemblances to human figures are placed, with rude letters beneath, scarcely intelligible enough to inform the inquirer that they are intended for the names of the three principal saints whose festivals occur during the month. These names are the only letterpress in the book; for in three columns beneath, are ranged the strangest collection of signs—somewhat between very coarsely executed Chinese characters, and a child's first attempt at writing,—each indicating a day of the month. On looking closely over this curious table, we find there are two crescents and one large circle, evidently lunar signs; then we perceive something resembling—though very remotely—a hand; an equally dim resemblance to an eye, and something that, with some stretch of the imagination, might be recognised as a flower, or a branch. Then we have a tolerable pair of shears, and a fork, and an unmistakeable hatchet, while the rest of the page is filled up with the most unintelligible signs. On reference to the explanation, we find that each sign indicates the occupation for that particular day of which it stands representative. Thus the shears point out the day for hair-cutting, and the hand, that for cutting of nails—two operations scarcely important enough to require especial notice,—while the hatchet signifies felling trees, the fork manuring, and the nondescript flower, planting. Most strange and arbitrary signs inform the reader which day is Sunday, and which is holiday; a kind of pyramid marks the *jour ourable*; a circle, the same size as the full moon, but with a cross inside, indicates the day for physic-taking; and a very strange sort of star, of very frequent occurrence, points out the proper day for bleeding. Is it not very likely that a kalendar, simple as this, may have been in use among the peasantry centuries before printing? The form of these signs reminded us much of characters carved on wood, rather than made by the pen, however rude that pen might have been. Might not such signs, therefore, cut on rude tallies, have cheaply supplied the lower classes, during the middle ages, with the same information, which, among the wealthier, was provided by the neatly-written parchment, or the costly illuminated volumes.

*Le Grand Compost, et Calendrier des Bergers, composé par le Berger de la grande Montagne, fort utile et profitable a gens de*

*tous états*, is a volume of some importance—a small quarto, consisting of 120 pages, and profusely adorned with woodcuts which, in the noble contempt of drawing and perspective, and coarseness of execution, fully rival those choice specimens of xylography, which some thirty or forty years ago, when the Seven Dials had an existence, adorned the ballad literature of the celebrated Mr. Catnach, the Murray of that locality. The frontispiece gives us the portrait of 'the shepherd,' his bagpipes under his arm, pointing upward with his finger, while the shepherds, each with bagpipe or flageolet beside him, are sitting round in various attitudes of attention and wonder, with a dog in the foreground, apparently as surprised as any of them. The kalendar follows with a goodly array of saints' days, and each month is headed with a moral quatrain, referring to the different stages of human life, which, contrary to the doctrine of the middle ages, which divided it into ten sevens, is divided by the shepherd into twelve intervals of six years each, a very convenient arrangement, which after almanac-makers took advantage of, seeing that it enabled them to fill up the twelve months, and added, too, a couple more years to the established length of man's life. Next follow rules in rhyme, both medical and dietary; then we have a horrible description, 'ballad-wise,' of *Les peines d'Enfer*, which we are informed Lazarus saw during his absence from the body, much resembling those legends which formerly were current among us under the title of St. Patrick's Purgatory. We gladly pass over the horrible cuts which illustrate this, and come to *Le Jardin des Vertus*, not an inappropriate sequel, but wretchedly prosing. 'The signs by which the shepherds know when a man is in health,' follow; but it seems scarcely necessary to invoke letter-press to tell us that, 'when he eats and drinks with a good appetite, and willingly takes recreation and enjoys himself with the merry,' he is so. The signs of sickness come next, and among them unwillingness to seek amusement and taciturnity are insisted upon—suggestive traits these of the French character. An English almanac-maker would scarcely have decided that a man was out of health because he was either silent or sulky.

The shepherd, prefacing his discourse with the remark that, 'shepherds who lie in the fields at night, see many signs,' now commences a marvellous meteorological lecture, in which the sun, moon, and planets, play a very subordinate part compared with comets, flaming stars, and fiery dragons. This lecture is 'profusely illustrated,' as the penny-publishers say, with cuts. A comet very hairy, and very fiery, with a tail resembling a broomstick; stars with bat's wings, about to pounce upon the astonished shepherds' heads; and an unmistakable dragon with staring eyes

and a most voluminous tail, breathing out volumes of smoke. The shepherd does not say much about them, probably deeming their portraits were quite sufficient; he however tells us that all manner of mischief is to be expected from their appearance. Next comes 'the table of the four complexions'—that indispensable adjunct to the almanac, even to our own, some fifty years ago; and then follow some curious physiognomical remarks. Among them we find that wide nostrils signify gluttony; while large eyes indicate 'idleness, effrontery, disobedience, and pride;' smaller eyes have scarcely a better character, but blear eyes, and those half-opened, or '*estendu*, warn us of malice, revenge, and treason.' A rather pretty ballad called *Les dict des Oiseaux*, in which each bird gives some piece of good counsel, rules for agricultural labour, and some medical recipes, conclude this curious volume, which, while deserving of especial notice, as so characteristic a relic of the 'old original almanacs,' affords an emphatic illustration of the low state of popular literature in the remoter districts of France, where from year to year it is still largely purchased and read.

Most probably there were almanacs—kalendars at least—among us, at as early a date as *Le Grand Compost*; we have not, however, been able to discover any, and the first that claims our notice is a small quarto volume, entitled *A Prognostication of Righte Good Effect*, set forth by Leonard Digges. This is adorned with a very curious sphere on the title-page, which informs us it was 'imprynted at London wythin the Black Fryars, by Thomas Gemini, 1555.' An earlier copy of this, however, seems from the dedication to have been published in 1553, and many copies for subsequent years are still extant. This must be rather considered as a kalendar with ample astronomical and still more ample astrological observations than an almanac, for the changes of the moon are not given, but instead, rules for finding the new moon for seven years to come. It begins with 'many pleasant and chosen rules for ever to judge of alteration of the weather.' First, according to the day on which the moon changes; if on Sunday, dry; if on Tuesday, windy; if on Wednesday, 'wonderful—we wish Master Leonard Digges had been rather more explicit here;—if on Thursday, fair and clear; if on Friday, 'mixt weather;' if on Saturday, moist. Then the planets in the different signs also influence the weather; and lastly, the day of the week on which New Year's day falls, determines the general character of the ensuing year. Thus, if on Friday, we shall find 'the somer scante pleasant, harvest indifferent, little store of fruit, wine, and honey; corn deare, many bleare eyes, youth shall die, plenty of thunders and tempests, with a soden death of cattel.'

A whimsical concatenation of ill-luck this, quite sufficient to prove that Friday still merited its mediæval character of misfortune. New Year's day on Saturday prognosticates 'a mean winter, somer very hot, a late harvest, good chepe garden herbes, plenty of hempe, flax, and honey.' The importance of 'plenty of hempe,' we soon discovered, for Master Digges goes on to say, as a drawback to his foregoing pleasant prophecy, that 'murders shall be sodenly committed in many places for light matters;' so plenty of halters would doubtless be required. Several astronomical tables follow, and in one of them we are told that the distance of the moon from the earth is 15,750 miles, while the distance of Mereury is only 12,812; and then the influence of the planets 'in conjunction, quadrature, or opposition to the moon,' is set forth at some length. Saturn's conjunction with the moon 'causeth unlucky days.' Her conjunction with Jupiter 'showeth a fortunate day to obtain suits of kings, nobles, prelates,' even of lawyers! Mars is a less fortunate star; however, when in conjunction with the moon, 'it is meet to finish all manner of fiery workes, alsoe for valiaunt captaines, but unmeet for journeying, or to seeke friendship.' The conjunction of the sun and moon indicates 'a very unhappy day for all matters, therefore, neither plante, build, sow, nor journey.' Venus is a most fortunate planet; and when she is in conjunction with the moon, then is the time 'to woo, to marry, to follow all maner of pleasant pastimes, and not unmeet to hire servauntes, or to let bloode.' The last recommendation harmonizes strangely enough with the mention of 'all maner of pleasant pastimes.' Mereury in conjunction with the moon is 'fortunate to buy and sell, to set children to their learning, to journey, and to send embassages,' while the moon and the 'dragon's head' bring all manner of good fortune, and 'dragon's tail' inflicts all manner of evil and danger. Such was the belief of our forefathers until a comparatively recent period—a poetic belief, for it linked the frail child of a day with the glorious orbs of heaven. Nor did it, like the purblind notions of fate or necessity, thrust the Creator out of His own universe.

'Astra regunt homines, sed regit astra Deus,'

was the motto of the pious believer in astrology, and there were many such; and thus God-fearing men sought anxiously for a 'fortunate day' for Elizabeth's coronation; and Burghley carefully pored over the horoscope provided by Dr. Dee's utmost skill, when danger from France seemed to threaten her.

For several years this *Prognostication*—a work, we may here remark, evidently addressed to educated men, indeed a 'scholar's book' in comparison with common almanacs—duly made its



appearance, until 1576, when we find Leonard Digges had been gathered to his fathers, and that his son now published it, 'corrected and augmented.' Very suggestive are these augmentations. There are many new astronomical tables, and among them 'a perfit description of the celestial orbs, according to the 'most ancient doctrine of Pythagoras, lately revived by Copernicus.' There is also a 'shorte discourse touching the variation of the compasse;' and another on 'errors in the arte of navigation commonly practised, and a dissertation on the use of the 'quadrant.' Pleasant notices these, bringing to our mind the days of Frobisher and Willoughby, and Drake's adventurous voyage round the world, and Raleigh's search after spice-breathing islands and gold-paved cities. The dissertation on the quadrant is adorned with an engraving of it, which almost fills the small quarto page. The directions for its use begin, 'take hold of him handsomely,' a strange phrase, we thought, until we remembered that 'handsomely' was often used in the sense of with boldness, or spirit, and therefore Master Thomas Digges' meaning was, that notwithstanding its outlandish, almost 'heathenish' appearance, the quadrant was to be seized boldly and held firmly, and then the student would find that it was no conjuror's instrument, but one well fitted to do the mariner good service.

Meanwhile other almanacs were making their appearance, and Dr. Dee soon after entered the field. There is *An Almanac newly sette forth*, published by him in 1571; and there is also an *Ephemeris* in Latin, full filled with astrological signs for 1577. The English almanac, also a small quarto, has a frontispiece displaying a blazing sun, a hand holding a sphere, to which another hand points with a pair of compasses. This is a regular almanac, with the list of days down one side of the page, the other side blank for memoranda. The changes of the moon, however, are not indicated in the kalendar, but in a separate table. There is much of the usual almanac information in this; prognostics of changes in the weather, as indicated by natural objects, such as the redness of the moon foretelling wind; the moaning of the sea, storms; the early flight of swallows portending a severe winter; all these we find almost verbatim the same as in the almanacs of the present year. That useful rhyme, too,

'Thirty days hath September,'

we found word for word; here the distich, however, relating to leap-year is omitted. After an ample list of fairs, come the 'general prognostications' for each quarter. We looked with some interest over these, expecting to find some obscure hints, at least, as to the state of the nation, perhaps of Protestant Europe;

but, 'the sun in Gemini' is only pointed out as portending a favourable seed-time; and his progress through Cancer, and Virgo, and Libra afford no prognostics of weal or woe to the nation, although there were then intrigues and plots enough to have busied all the heavenly bodies, had they been as mindful of mundane affairs as their inquirers believed. But throughout the whole of this reign prognostics, like secret despatches, were considered as a kind of state arcana. Indeed, the Act, originally passed in the reign of her father, and revived and extended by Elizabeth against persons publishing in any way 'any fond, fantastical, or false prophecy upon, or by occasion of any arms, fields, beasts, badges, or such other like thing,' although, as the reader may see, referring to heraldic bearings, might, by a very slight stretch of construction, be made to refer to astrological signs. Who could say whether the 'dragon's head' might not be intended for the red dragon of the Tudors? Leo for the crowned lion of England? nay, even Virgo herself be intended to typify that

'Fair vestal thrond by the West.'

So Dr. Dee and his colleagues contented themselves with prognostications of the most innocent vagueness—prophesying a blight upon the cherry-trees, or an abundance of apples; the prevalence of chincoughs, or perhaps of 'strong thieves;' but never attempting a political allusion, save to 'Turk and Pope,' personages whose downfall was constantly foretold, both by theologians and astrologers, but who in some way managed to survive and do some mischief, notwithstanding all the predictions of two or three generations of 'philomaths.'

Toward the close of Elizabeth's reign almanacs appear, as we have remarked, to have become a necessity for all classes. At the beginning of the following reign, we find at least a dozen, evidently enjoying a wide circulation, and several of them of some years' standing. There is Lighterfoot's, Bretnor's, Hopton's, Dade's, Gresham's, White's, and 'Henry Alleyne, practitioner of physick,' who presents his 'to the courteous and studious reader,' in some very prosing rhymes; and 'Jeffery Neve, physician;' and 'John Wodchouse, philomath;' and 'Daniel Browne, a well-wisher to the mathematics,' who prefixes a most elaborate advertisement, showing that he teaches arithmetic and book-keeping 'after the Italian method of double entry.' These are London almanacs; but we have also Kaye's, published at York; Vaux's, 'imprynted at St. Ellen's, Auckland;' 'Gilden's, published at Shipston-on-Stour, and may well serve for all the south parts.' While all these little manuals—for the almanac is now reduced

to its pocket-book dimensions—contain the kalendar, each day of it duly placed under guardianship of its appropriate sign; and the changes of the moon are also duly noted, and the prognostications for the four quarters of the year, always vague enough, subjoined, there is still much variety in their contents, so much so, indeed, that we think each purchaser might be able to select one exactly to his mind. John Wodehouse, although he subscribes himself ‘philomath,’ meddles very little with learned matters; he gives a very large list of fairs, also ample directions for sowing and planting, showing how cabbages are to be sown in the wane of the moon, and radishes at the increase; how gilliflowers are to be planted ‘in an old moon,’ and parsley sown at the full. Similar directions we meet with in ‘White’s;’ but then, in addition, he gives us tables of ‘things good to comforte the head, the stomach, and the heart.’ These are very amusing, and show that ‘the lowering system’ had no attractions for our forefathers. For the head, musk and rosemary, together with the less pleasant, either in scent or taste, camomile and rue, are recommended among many others. For the stomach, ginger, nutmeg—indeed, the whole contents of the housewife’s spice-box—together with quince, that favourite sweetmeat, which in the cookery-books of this period fills up some pages with a dozen recipes how to make it into jelly, syrup, or conserve; and wormwood too, not quite so pleasant a medicine, but perhaps more beneficial. The last-mentioned is ‘coral,’ but in what manner this very scarce, and, popularly, almost unknown remedy is to be taken is not mentioned. As Lord Burghley, however, on one occasion took for gout in the stomach ‘bone of stag’s heart and powdered coral,’ perhaps it was to be administered in the same form, and for the same complaint. ‘Things good for the hearte’ are all manner of spices and vegetable tonics, also ‘pearles.’ This most costly medicine had great attraction for our forefathers, both in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. We frequently read of ‘magistery of pearls’ being taken, with what benefit it might be doubtful, did we not remember that in that imaginative and all-believing age the Babington motto *Foy est toute* might be inscribed upon every pill and potion. This dietary is followed by a list of ‘things hurtful to the teeth;’ among these, ‘nuts, lemons, and sweetmeats’ are placed. Among ‘things hurtful to the eyes’ we find ‘dust and smoke’—it scarcely needed an almanac to tell us this; and also ‘reading presently after supper,’ a most vexatious warning to the hardworking student of that age, who looked forward to ‘after supper’ as his choicest time for reading; for that meal was then taken at five o’clock, or at latest at six.

Perhaps, however, he was only to be reminded by it of the venerable direction—

‘After supper walk a mile,’

and then he might be permitted ‘to outwatch the Bear,’ or pursue his delightful studies even till the grey dawn.

The foregoing almanacs give their directions in homely prose; several others invoke the aid of verse, although homely enough. Thus, Kaye, in his York almanac for 1607, indites the following doggrel for the January directions:—

‘Hote clothes, warm brothes,  
Bathes tried, sloth fled,  
Are excellent.’

For March the rules are—

‘Bleeding wisely, eating precisely,  
Warming with reason, bathing in season,  
Are excellent.’

And thus he goes on through the whole twelve months. Jeffery Neve, physician, sets forth his rules in rather more musical numbers:—

‘Now gallant May, in his array,  
Doth make the fields pleasaunt and gay;  
Walke early now for thy health’s sake,  
And still thou mayest some physicke take.’

The last piece of advice forms almost the *refrain* of each verse; indeed, excepting February and December, we cannot call to mind a single month in which the recommendation does not occur. Verse is also employed to give shrewd touches at the times, such as the pride of the wealthy, the extravagance of female apparel, the rapacity of usurers, the tricks of lawyers, who appear to be objects of especial dislike; while Pond, in his almanac for 1611, after various denunciations, in which almost every sort and condition of men come in for a share, ends by thus including the three professions in his anathema:—

‘The Physician, yea, the Lawyer, and sometimes the Divine,  
Being led captive with pleasure, gold, and wine,  
Do put soules, bodys, and goodes in danger perillous;  
From these three abuses good Lord deliver us!’

In a better spirit, though in scarcely a more poetical, does Hopton indite his lessons of thriftiness. He is a kind of earlier Poor Richard, with tables of interest, and ‘a necessary table for expenses,’ and numerous precepts in prose and verse, showing how ‘small savings make large gains;’ and how—

‘He who gets a groat a day, and in a day it spendeth,  
 May long time live, but little have, whatever he intendeth;  
 Who in a day doth get a groat, and of it doth twopence spend,  
 May quickly thrive, and somewhat get to give unto a friend;  
 But he that spends a groat a day, and earneth but twopence,  
 Shall claw a beggar by the ear, whate’er was his pretence.’

We have little doubt that these homely lines were carefully written out in text-hand, and with flourishes, by many a school-boy for his Christmas piece; and that many a copy of Hopton’s almanac was purchased by thrifty citizens for their ‘toward’ apprentices, and given with the bright, bran-new milled shilling on New Year’s morning. Indeed, we should think Hopton’s was the favourite city almanac; it held its standing during the wars of the Parliament, and we found a copy even as late as the days of the Protectorate.

Master Gresham’s almanac is curious for giving a prediction for each day throughout the year; not of public matters, for with the terrors of the High Commission Court before their eyes, almanac-makers were fain to keep aloof from all meddling with affairs of State, as warily as in the days of Elizabeth, but of what might occur to the reader from day to day. Thus the first of January is marked as a ‘good day,’ and the word is ‘mutual assent.’ On the 6th and 7th, we read, ‘as it is managed,’ while the 24th hints, ‘not very secure.’ February has many unlucky days, and the word for the 8th and 9th, ‘over shoes, over boots,’ points to an accumulation of misfortunes. Most of these predictions are vague enough; ‘good, if warily handled,’ ‘presse on and prevaile,’ ‘looke about you,’ are capable of a very wide application. We were, however, rather surprised to read for All Fools’ day, then kept as a day of general joking and merriment, ‘evil and malice;’ and for Christmas day, so emphatically devoted to peace and good-will, the equally incongruous motto ‘unkind and perverse.’ Probably the readers merely took these predictions as matter of amusement, for Bretuor’s almanac, also one of wide circulation, has a similar series, but even more vague than Gresham’s.

Notwithstanding the astrological jargon, and their amusing lists of the wholesomes and unwholesomes, these little hand-books contain an amount of general information far greater than the reader who has formed his opinion of these times from popular histories would expect. There is always a table of historical events, ancient and modern, fairly correct; a complete list of market-towns in England, with their distances from London; sometimes a list of the cross-roads also. Then we have a table of ‘distances of some of the most famous cities in the world from

the honourable city of London;' among these we find Jerusalem, Mexico, and 'the famous city of Calicut.' Nineveh and Babylon also take their place in this table, and we smile to read that the latter is just 2710 miles off. But geographical knowledge was very unsettled then; still, that the trader and the farmer should seek to know aught about these far-off lands shows how widely the spirit of inquiry had spread. The astronomical tables are mostly very full. In several, the method of determining the rising of the star, of taking the altitude of the sun, and of drawing the meridian line, are given. The various changes in the heavenly bodies are frequently noted, too, without the slightest allusion to their benign or sinister aspect on our mundane affairs; while the phrase, often used, 'that beautiful planet Venus,' seems to show that even the almanac-maker of those days felt that the stars were indeed 'the poetry of heaven,' and a beauty no less than a mystery.

In one curious respect we find the writer far in advance of the time, for Daniel Browne, 'well-willer to the mathematics,' in the year 1607, actually gives a double numbering of the days of the year, one column being headed 'the English accompt,' and the other beside it 'the Roman accompt,' and in the latter, January 1st figures as the 11th, thus anticipating by nearly a hundred and fifty years the adoption of the new style. We find in some of these very full directions for drawing leases, and other legal forms, and lists of law officers. It is suggestive to see among these, names that have filled a page in history. Some of the country almanacs have a singularly ample list of saints' days, including numerous Saxon names. There are numerous church directions, too; not improbably these circulated among the Catholic population of the northern parts. The stringency of the rules of the English church at this time is suggestively indicated in many of the almanacs, which give, appended to the list of law terms, 'the times of marriage for this year.' In Vaux, 1608, we have this curious notification. 'Weddings comes in '13th January, and goes out again the 23rd. It comes in again 'April 4th, and goes out again 1st daye of May. It comes in 'again the 23rd, and goeth out again the 27th daye of November.' In passing, we may observe that the growing Puritan feeling in London seems to be indicated by the very scanty list of saints' days which most of them published there include.

After an interval of some thirteen years, during which none seem to have been preserved, we open a very thick volume, containing the almanacs for 1630—a full score of them. Many old acquaintances meet us here—White and Wodehouse, with their lists of wholesomes, and rules for sowing and planting;

Daniel Browne, and his new-style kalendar; and Jeffery Neve, still celebrating 'gallant May;' and Hopton teaching the sons, just as he had taught their fathers, the value of the 'groat a day,' if duly managed. There are, however, some new adventurers into this field of literature. Richard Allestree, whose prognostications respecting the weather are given with Murphy-like minuteness, and whose poetical announcements are all carefully ended 'sermonwise.' Thus, in April—

'Tellus awakes from sleep, and now is seen,  
In spite of winter, clad again in green.  
Wake, sluggish man! lest thou be taken napping,  
By Satan's dormitives thy sense entrapping.'

The religious character of these new almanacs is indeed strongly marked—another proof we think of the still increasing Puritan tendencies of London. Ranger, who abounds in medical directions, sums up his gloomy catalogue of diseases likely to occur, with the remark, 'from these, but especiaillie from the speckled leprosie of the soule, the good Lord deliver us.' Hewlett, in a dissertation prefixed to his almanac, says, 'the dumb creatures set forth God's glory, and perform obedience to their Creator; they never cease to do their duty and office set, yet 'man, alas! for whom all these creatures were made, is ever starting aside from the Lord his maker.' As may be expected much of the religious moralizing is very commonplace; the poetry, too, which abounds in these later almanacs, is mostly prosing enough. We must, however, here make an exception in favour of Evans' almanac, the fullest of information of any, and containing some really fine poetry. Here is the conclusion of the address to 'the Ruler of the universe':—

'In glory Thou in Heaven art, in mercy here below,  
In judgment with the demon-crew, the seas Thy wonders show;  
Yet sea, nor earth, nor heavens hic, Thy essence can contain,  
Thou art, hast bin, and ever shalt, I AM of might remain.

It is not wealth, nor Ophir-gold that can enrich our need,  
Nor pleasing dainties that we take that can our bodies feed;  
It is Thy blessing from above, Thy strong protecting arm,  
That feeds, protects Thy children dear, from penury and harm.

Eternal King! immortal God! all kingdoms are Thine own,—  
Thy power, Thy wisdom, and Thy might, to us doth make Thee known;  
All honour, glory, praise, and laud, be rendered Thee by men,  
Unto Thy sacred majesty, for evermore, Amen!

Who could possibly imagine that the publisher—perhaps the composer, too, of these noble lines—was one of the most dis-

reputable of a disreputable fraternity, the astrologers of Shoe-lane. And yet so it was; for 'John Evans, philomath,' of Gunpowder-alley, in that too famous locality, was the 'excellent wise man who studied the black art,' and who had the credit of initiating no less celebrated a personage than Master William Lilly into the arts and mysteries of 'setting a figure and casting nativities,' but who also had the reputation of being covetous, fraudulent, and dreadfully addicted to drinking; and then, as his pupil naively tells us, 'was so abusive and quarrelsome that he was seldom without a black eye or some mischief or other.' Little would the reader believe this, as he turned over '*Evans' Almanac for 1630*,' a manual so well written—in some parts even so eloquently written; so full of good advice, too, and so full of general information. But Evans, as we further learn from Lilly's very minute account, had received a university education, was a Master of Arts, and in orders. He had formerly had a parish in Staffordshire, but 'being in a manner enforced to fly for some offences very scandalous committed by him in these parts, he came to try his fortune in London.' And we have little doubt that his almanac proved a 'good get-penny,' as the phrase then was; for in addition to ample lists of 'things wholesome and unwholesome,' and 'things to be avoided,' we have one of 'meates good (bad, we should rather think,) to begot melancholie—a visitation which sorely frightened our forefathers, although they were scarcely able to define what they meant by it. 'Brawne, hare's flesh, salt meates,' and 'thicke wines,' are among these, but strangely enough, he adds, 'beef.' The medical directions are very full for each month, and one that occurs under August, seems to corroborate the opinion which has been held by some medical writers, that the plague, in its earlier and milder approaches, was a species of influenza: this is, 'take heed of sudden colds, for nothing sooner breedeth the plague.' The prognostications of the coming seasons are very precise; and the meteorological observations are really excellent; there are also some slight attempts at political prophecy, but evidently with great caution—vague hints of coming trouble in Protestant Germany, but explicit notification of the overthrow of 'the Turk.'

But the time was drawing on—it was even at hand, when the political almanac should almost supersede every other, and when the astrologer should play in England well nigh as important a part as he did in Wallenstein's army. A very curious additional chapter in the history of the Parliamentary war might be written on the almanac-makers who, up to the eve of Naseby fight, promised misguided Charles undoubted victory, or nerved the arm of the stout Parliament soldier by prophecies that he should



smite down Baal. A different class many of these seem to have been from their earlier brethren. Some occupying a rather higher station, and some apparently respectable enough. Such Booker seems to have been, whom even his rival Lilly acknowledges as 'a very honest man;' and although we cannot hold Lilly himself in any high esteem; still, that he was respectable in his station, and possessed a small independent property, we know.

It was not want which drove William Lilly into that 'profession,' to which, according to his friend, worthy, credulous Elias Ashmole, he was so great an ornament, but desire for knowledge, awakened, as he tells us, by the discourse of a justice of peace's clerk, as they stood one Sunday talking before service—it were well had they been more suitably employed—about learned men; nay, one so great a scholar that he could make an 'almanac,' which to me then was strange. One speech begot 'another, till at last he said he could bring me acquainted 'with one Evans in Gunpowder-alley,' the very respectable personage to whom we have already introduced the reader. To Evans they went during the following week, 'but he having been 'drunk the night before, was upon his bed, if bed it could be 'called whercon he then lay.' The miserable sot was however roused up, and 'after some compliments' agreed to take the wondering young man as a pupil; and so rapid was his progress that in seven or eight weeks he could 'set a figure perfectly.' But Lilly did not forthwith commence almanac-making; he seems at first to have contented himself with the meaner pursuits of astrology, and to have questioned the stars not on the fate of men and kingdoms, but as to the whereabouts of silver cups or purses unaccountably missing. Having a competency bequeathed him by his old mistress—the cunning young serving-man had persuaded her to marry him—and having taken a second wife, a dreadful termagant, as he ruefully tells us, he retired to Hershams in 1636, and there resided until the commencement of the civil wars; doubtless from the loopholes of his retreat casting many a shrewd look on the 'growing confusion of the times,' and balancing in his mind to which party he should give in his adhesion. Not very quickly did he decide. Edgehill had been fought with doubtful advantage on either side; then the first battle of Newbury had confirmed the hopes of the Royalists, and Charles, though an exile from his capital, was holding his court at Oxford. But then the Parliament was still a name of power; it had brought the Primate of all England to its bar, and was proceeding vigorously in its work of reformation. Still the wary astrologer hesitated; and not until the spring of 1644, when,

although the king's affairs seemed more favourable than heretofore, the Scots army had entered England, and the hopes of the Puritan party began to revive, did he quit his country retreat, 'perceiving,' as he honestly enough says, 'that there was money to be got in London.'

There were many almanac-writers there already, prophesying success to the Parliament, while 'old Master William Hodges' at Wolverhampton, and Captain Wharton at Oxford, were as confident that the stars were on the side of royalty. So with much caution, though with an evident leaning toward the Parliament, Lilly put forth in April, 1644, his *Merlinus Anglicus Junior*. This is a small thin quarto pamphlet, containing predictions for the eight remaining months of the year; some of them vague enough. Thus: 'if our armies be near, there will be blows.' 'Observe who is in danger at the latter end of May, or, at the conjunction of Saturn and Mars on the 31st.' He further remarks, under July, that 'the first week will prove bloody enough;' likely enough, with fighting going on in the west, and the south, and the north. *Merlinus* was, however, most favourably received; the first impression was sold off in less than a week, and Lilly having presented a copy 'unto the then Mr. Whitelocke,' he 'by accident was reading thereof in the House of Commons. One looked upon it, and so did many,' and in the sequel the members of the honourable House became interested in the work and the author. 'John Booker,' however, who had already constituted himself interpreter-general of the stars to the Parliament, and who unfortunately was 'licenser of all mathematical books,' was not best pleased to encounter a successful rival; so he made many objections, but our shrewd 'Sidrophel' was more than a match for the guileless John Booker. He complained of him to some of the members, and 'they gave me orders forthwith to reprint it as I would.' The stars certainly smiled upon Lilly's *début* as almanac-maker, for, only two months after the appearance of his *Merlinus*, London was startled with what he calls 'supernatural sights and apparitions,' but which seem to have been the Northern lights. Forthwith a pamphlet with a most obscure woodcut, in which we may discover something like three suns, and some very nondescript stars, came forth, full of astrological jargon, but pointing at some eventual success of the Parliament forces. What could be more opportune. Gainsborough was relieved ere July closed, while Marston Moor on the 3rd of September proved beyond all question that the very prince of astrologers was William Lilly.

The high standing of *Merlinus Anglicus* was now thoroughly established, and eagerly was it sought after for the eventful year

1645. But the prophecies were vague enough; very different from the predictions of the royalist almanacs, which promised the king a speedy triumph over all his enemies. Indeed the sanguine hopes entertained by Charles and his adherents up to the very eve of the battle of Naseby, seem almost as though intended to lure him on to his overthrow. 'I am now full fraught with expectations,' he writes to the queen at the end of March; 'our army marches to-morrow to put an end to Fairfax's excellency,' is his next despatch in April. In May: 'thank God, my affairs begin to smile upon me again;' even on the 9th of June, only *five* days before the triumphant victory of Naseby, he exults that 'without 'being too much sanguine, I may affirm that since this rebellion 'my affairs were never in so fair and hopeful a way!' No wonder Captain George Wharton, in addition to the earlier prognostications of his *Loyal Almanac*, set forth, on May 7, 1645, *An Astrological Judgment upon his Majesty's present march from Oxford*, in which, after much jargon of 'Taurus culminating, and dragon's head near the cuspe ascending,' he bids the poor deluded king go forth, 'for it is apparent' to every impartial judgment, that 'although his Majesty cannot be expected to be secured from 'every trivial disaster that may befall his army, yet, the several 'junctions of the Houses duly considered and compared, do 'generally render his Majesty and his whole army unexpectedly 'victorious and successful in all his designs.' And with what full assurance of faith did plumed cavalier and red-coated trooper march out from vanquished Leicester to chastise the rebels who had dared to lay siege even to that especial *Aula regis*, Oxford, when the king, and the king's own astrologer, had both so unfalteringly assured them of victory. And how, after the proud fight of Naseby, did the exulting Parliament army scoff at Captain George Wharton and his unlucky prediction, he who, like 'Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah,' had bidden the deluded monarch 'go up to Ramoth Gilead and prosper,' that monarch who was now a fugitive none knew whither.

Meanwhile, even until within two days of the fight, Lilly was silent; then he probably began his answer to Wharton, but there is little doubt that news of the victory had been received ere his *Answer to an Astrological Judgment* went to press. This he dates June 12th, and as it was doubtless widely circulated as soon as rumours of the victory reached London, we doubt not but his credulous admirers firmly believed the date to be a true one, and that the wondrous prophet had received supernatural notice of the battle forty-eight hours before it had been gained. This little tract, of about four pages, is written with some humour. 'He is 'none of his Majesty's friends that gave directions for this

'march,' he remarks, 'as the sequel will tell you, ere you return to your winter-quarters—if any be left you. \* \* 'Face about, 'gentlemen,' says one, 'for our honour,' as you faced about at 'Newbury, with a good pair of heels.' He is very sarcastic too, upon the poor Captain, and more than hints that his knowledge of the stars, and of arms, are equally worthless.

From henceforward Lilly was actually a person of political importance, and when three years after he published *An Astrological Prediction for the three coming Years*, he dedicated it boldly to 'the right honourable the knights, citizens, and burgesses of the House of Commons,' addressing them as 'Unwearied Sirs,' and expressing the gratitude of the nation to them. In his opening remarks, he rather prettily says, 'Some years since, God called me from a happy contemplative life, sufficiently pleasing to my quiet genius, being content with an angle in my hand, a booke in my study, a flower in my garden;' but his duty (!) directed him to London, and he dared not resist. Lilly, however, did not always continue in favour with the Parliament. On one occasion a passage in one of his almanacs was construed into a reflection upon the Commissioners of Excise, and he was brought before a committee of the House. The shrewd astrologer having several friends among the members managed to escape punishment: and it being well known that he was friendly to the army he was 'carried with a coach and four horses' to Windsor, where the head-quarters then were. Here he and Booker were 'welcomed thither, and feasted in a garden where General Fairfax lodged.' They were then introduced to him, and the following curious colloquy passed between them:—

'The general, in effect, said thus much.—'That God had blessed the army with many signal victories, and yet their work was not finished. He hoped God would go along with them until His work was done. They sought not themselves, but the welfare and tranquillity of the good people and whole nation: As for the art we studied, he hoped it was lawful and agreeable to God's word: he understood it not; but doubted not but we both feared God, and therefore had a good opinion of us both.'

'Unto his speech I presently made this reply.—'My lord, I am glad to see you here at this time. Certainly, both the people of God, and all others of this nation, are very sensible of God's mercy, love, and favour unto them in directing the Parliament to nominate and elect you general of their armies, a person so religious and so valiant . . . Sir, as for ourselves, we trust in God, and as Christians believe in him. We do not study any art but what is lawful and consonant to the Scriptures, fathers, and antiquity, which we humbly desire you to believe.'

'The Scriptures, fathers, and antiquity'—glibly enough does the

cunning astrologer, whose youth was spent as serving-man to old Gilbert White, of Fleet Market, enumerate these. But Lilly knew that assumption of superior knowledge was necessary to the almanac-maker, and therefore he would have boldly asserted his knowledge of Chinese itself, if his plan had required it. They then took leave, 'and went to visit Mr. Peters, the minister, who lodged in the castle.' He was reading a new pamphlet. 'Lilly, thou art 'herein,' said he. 'Are not you there also?' I replied. 'Yes, 'that I am,' quoth he, and forthwith, little heeding the abuse of pamphleteers, they fell into 'conference, and much private discourse.' Alas! little did the Parliament foresee the results of that coach-and-four journey, and that feasting in the garden; above all, that conference with Hugh Peters. From henceforward, the stars looked with but sinister aspect upon their deliberations, and the 'most valiant and religious army' became the object of the most favourable astral influences. It seems astonishing to us, to perceive how important a part Lilly and Booker took in political affairs. During the siege of Colchester, they were sent down expressly 'to encourage the soldiers that the town would very shortly be surrendered;' and while Charles still placed reliance on Captain Wharton's predictions—we wonder he did so after that terrible blunder of Naseby—he certainly cast a longing eye towards the astrologer of the Roundheads. When meditating his escape from Hampton Court, he actually sent a Mrs. Whorwood to request a prediction. Lilly was not likely to refuse any service that might be well paid; perhaps, too, he thought, like some others, that there would be less trouble in allowing the king to slip quietly away, than in detaining him, so he 'erected a figure,' and gave his judgment that the king might be safe if he went eastward. But Charles meanwhile had fled to the west, and, as the reader knows, the result was his re-capture and ultimate death.

Not a hint of Lilly's double-dealing seems to have reached the Parliament; still they felt displeased with him, and no wonder, for in his next almanac he prophesied that 'the Parliament stood 'in a tottering condition, and that the commonalty and soldiery 'would join together against them;' a prediction correct enough, but only too early by a year or two. Again he was summoned before 'the honourable House,' but having timely notice, the cunning knave

'presently sent for Mr. Warren, the printer, an assured Cavalier, and obliterated what was most offensive, put in other more significant words, and desired only to have six amended copies against next morning, which very honestly he brought me. I told him my design was

to deny the book found fault with, and own only the six books. I told him I doubted he would be examined.' 'Hang them,' said he, 'they are all rogues; I'll swear myself to the devil ere they shall have an advantage against you, by my oath.'

So the precious pair next day made their appearance, prepared to swear through thick and thin; Lilly declaring that 'some malicious Presbyterian' had written the offending almanac, and laying the 'amended' copies on the table, as the only books he would own. The committee were much puzzled,—counterfeit almanacs were very common, and party rage ran so high, that Lilly's explanation did not seem so very improbable; so a long discussion ensued, curious enough for the recognition of the respectable standing—almost authorized standing—of the almanac-maker. 'You do not know the services this man hath done for the Parliament, or how many times in our greatest distresses he hath refreshed our languishing expectations,' urges a Mr. Reynolds; 'I assure you his writings have kept up the spirits both of the soldiery, the honest people of this nation, and many of us Parliament men.' 'I assure you his name is famous all over Europe,' said Mr. Strickland, the late minister at the Hague. Notwithstanding the efforts of his friends, Lilly was ordered into custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms. Just then, 'Oliver Cromwell, Lieutenant-General of the army, having never seen me, caused me to be produced again, when he steadfastly beheld me for a good space, and then I went with the messenger.' That steadfast look is a very characteristic trait, and leads us to believe that, excepting some occasional exaggerations, Lilly's autobiography is worthy of credit. 'That night, Oliver Cromwell went to Mr. Reynolds. 'What,' said he, 'never a man to take Lilly's cause in hand but yourself? none take his part but you?' No wonder Lilly soon after perceived that the stars looked with no common favour on the Lieutenant-general.

As the Parliament found they could no longer depend upon *Merlinus Anglicus* as heretofore, Vincent Wing seems to have tried to occupy Lilly's place. His almanac, therefore, became full of laudations of the Parliament and Presbyterianism, interspersed with very bitter predictions against the sectaries; while *Merlinus* saw more wondrous things than ever in store for our 'most valiant and self-denying army.' Meanwhile, Captain Wharton, undeterred by repeated failures, still prophesied the restoration of Church and King, comforting himself under his disappointments by consigning Parliament and army most heartily to the tender mercies of that personage whose aid was so frequently invoked by the Cavaliers. But the star of Charles' ascendant had set, never

to rise again, and the army was triumphant over King and Parliament. Great is the exultation of *Merlinus* thereat. In respect to the events of 1649, Lilly is singularly guarded; but, for 1650, he speaks out, and actually stumbles upon some prophecies which are very near the truth. Thus, for June, 'the Scot is now elevated, and seems to swell with very uncertain assurances of aid from various parts to annoy us.' This is a curious prediction, when we remember that, on the 16th, Charles II. landed in Scotland. For July, the prediction is, 'the Scot hath a mind to be troublesome; come not among us, Jocky;' and doubtless often was this defiance repeated by the Parliament soldiers, when, at the close of that very month, they crossed the Tweed. The prediction for August is more curious still. 'Let the attempt be made against us by Scot or devil, we shall keep our own, and have victory over all invaders.' We have been told that, 'on the day of one of their fights in Scotland, a soldier stood, with *Anglicus* in his hand, and, as the several troops passed by him, cried, 'Lo! hear what Lilly saith; you are in this month promised victory; fight it out, brave boys;' and then he read that month's prediction.' It was doubtless the one just quoted: and although August had just passed—only by three days—that confident prophecy of complete victory was well fitted to nerve the arm of the Parliament soldier at the gallant fight of Dunbar.

Not so successful in his predictions was Lilly, the following year,—the stars gave him no presage of that 'crowning mercy'—the battle of Worcester. For January, 1652, he, however, makes an allusion that proves he was well acquainted with state affairs. 'High mountains are now in strong travail, *nascetur tandem* a new representative.' Now, it was just about this time that Cromwell held that conference with Whitelock, in which he urged the expediency of the supreme power being placed in the hands of one person. We have little doubt, therefore, that the prediction was thrown out as a feeler. In Lilly's subsequent almanacs, there is little worth notice. We find him, however, still keeping exclusively to predictions of public affairs, leaving Vincent Wing to foretell that, 'about this time several mutations will happen to all sorts of people; also, about the middle of this month, expect pains in the teeth;' and Neve and Wodehouse to provide, as usual, tables of the wholesomes and unwholesomes. But that, during the Protectorate, he followed very successfully the profession of an intelligencer, there is little doubt; although, in his autobiography, he represents himself as merely 'giving judgment on stolen goods,' and such like; but could we discover Secretary Thurloe's private memoranda, among that crowd of intelligencers who brought to the great ruler of England news of

whatever took place in the remotest parts of Europe, the name of the wily astrologer 'of Corner-house, over against Strand Bridge,' would surely be found.

But that great ruler died, nor did the stars give any sign; and his son succeeded to an unchallenged rule, so all the almanac-makers for the year 1659 prophesied that the son would be heir to the father's proud fortune, and follow out his father's great plans. Alas! the events of 1659 told a very different story, and the astrologers were all confounded. Poor Lilly was compelled to apologize in his *Merlinus* for 1660, remarking, that 'the many turnings and windings, and frequent sudden alterations, revolutions, and changes in the government in 1659, what man or angel could predict?' So he assures his readers that 'it was the only hand and finger of God; the actions themselves so miraculous, so unexpected, that they were not in any ways to be found out by the sharpest rules of astrology.' Then, flinging aside all pretence to astral knowledge, he very truly says, 'the reason of our so inconsiderate failings, monthly, concerning Richard, the late Protector, was, that seeing the unanimity of the nations, and that he was courted by all, or most of the English allies,' he really followed out his own judgment in foretelling the continuance of the Protectorate. 'We write this year in great perplexity of spirit,' is the conclusion of the preface, which bears the date of Nov. 8th, 1659. His prognostications, however, unlike those in the *Merlinus* for 1659, sometimes offer guesses very near the truth. Thus, in his prediction for April, he remarks, it will begin 'with fair pretensions, sugared words, and promises;' while in May, 'the commonalty seem somewhat satisfied with an expectation of better days; they rejoice and hope well.' And rejoice they did—though most unwisely, on the 29th of that month. But strange as it may appear, after the many proofs furnished by himself of his very unscrupulous character, Lilly was at this crisis no time-server. Few almanac-makers would have written thus at the close of 1659. 'How much the death of one grand statesman may be of concernment, let the world take notice by the death of that superlative person, Oliver, late Lord Protector, whose death amazed and confounded all the consultations of Europe, especially France and Spain. But Oliver is dead; and though many may tyrannize over his dead body, yet, whilst alive, the greatest prattler that now lives durst not, unless in private, breathe forth his name with reproach. It's no less than the doggish index of a depraved mind in any man, to rob the dead of that honour which was due unto them when living.' Honour to William Lilly for this unbought tribute to the memory of the greatest ruler England ever saw, at a time



when South, Dryden, and Waller were eager to vilify him they had but just before offered incense to: let it be remembered as one of the redeeming traits in Lilly's character, that he alone, in the year 1660, dared to vindicate the fame of the great Protector.

With the Restoration, the history of the political almanac ends, and here we must conclude. Booker died soon after; Vincent Wing was forced to content himself with prophecies of murrain among the cattle, and toothache among his readers; while Captain Wharton, notwithstanding the violent outbursts of loyalty of his *Calendarium Ecclesiasticum* of 1660, lived to experience and deplore the usual gratitude of the Stuarts. Lilly, having received a pardon, took to physic, as well as astrology, still publishing his *Merlinus Anglicus*, but keeping far aloof from political matters. At length, in 1681, he died, in a good old age, and was buried in Walton church by his friend and admirer, credulous Elias Ashmole, who placed over his remains 'a fair black marble stone,' which he tells us with laudable minuteness, cost exactly 'six pounds, four shillings and sixpence.'

- ART. IV.—(1.) *Fasciculi Zizaniorum Magistri Johannis Wyclif cum Tritico: ascribed to Thomas Netter of Walden, Provincial of the Carmelite Order in England, and Confessor to King Henry V.* Edited by the Rev. WALTER WADDINGTON SHIRLEY, M.A., Tutor and late Fellow of Wadham College. Oxford. 8vo. Longmans.
- (2.) *The Quarterly Review*, No. 207. July, 1858.
- (3.) *Diatribæ in Johannis Wicliffi Reformationis Prodromi Vitæ, Ingenium, Scripta.* Auctore S. A. J. DE REUVER GRONEMAN, Theol. Doct. Trajecti ad Rhenum apud Rob. Natan. MDCCCXXXVII.
- (4.) *Die theologische Doctrin Johann Wycliffe's. Nach den Quellen dargestellt und Kritisch beleuchtet.* Von Dr. ERNST ANTON LEWALD, Kirchenrath und Professor der Theologie zu Heidelberg. ('The Theological Doctrine of John Wycliffe, exhibited from the Original Sources, and critically illustrated. By Dr. E. A. LEWALD.') In the *Quarterly Journal of Historical Theology* (*Zeitschrift für die Historische Theologie*); Parts 2 and 4 for 1846, and Part 4 for 1847.
- (5.) *Wiclif und die Lollarden. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchengeschichte Englands in den letzten 150 Jahren vor der Reformation.* Von GOTTHARD VICTOR LECHLER, Dr. Phil. Diakonus in Waiblingen bei Stuttgart. ('Wiclif and the Lollards. A Contribution to the Church History of England during the last 150 years before the

- Reformation. By Dr. G. V. LECHLER.) *Quarterly Journal of Historical Theology*, Parts 3 and 4 for 1853; and Part 2 for 1854.
- (6.) *Johann Wycliffe und seine Bedeutung für die Reformation.* Von OSCAR JAEGER, Phil. Dr. Gekrönte Preisschrift. ('John Wycliffe and his Importance with respect to the Reformation.' By Dr. O. JAEGER. A Prize Work.) Halle. 1844.
- (7.) *Geschichte der Kirchen Reformation in Gross Britannien.* Von Dr. GEORG WEBER, Professor und Schul-Direktor in Heidelberg. Neue Ausgabe. ('History of the Reformation of the Church in Great Britain. By Dr. G. WEBER, Professor and School-Director at Heidelberg.') (
- (8.) *Gerson, Wiclefus, Hussus inter se et cum Reformatorebus comparati.* Auctore J. C. A. WINKELMANN. Commentatio in Certamine Literario Civium Academiae Georgiae Augustae ex sententia Rev. Theol. Ord. die iv. mens. Jun. 1856. Præmio Regio ornata. ('Gerson, Wiclif, and Huss, compared with One Another and with the Reformers. University Prize Essay. By J. C. A. WINKELMANN.') Göttingen. 1857.
- (9.) *Wiclif, als Vorläufer der Reformation. Antritts, Vorlesung gehalten zu Leipzig, den 9 Juli, 1858.* Von G. V. LECHLER, der Phil. u. Theol. Dr., Superint. u. Ordent. Prof. der Theologie. ('Wiclif, considered as a Forerunner of the Reformation. An Inaugural Discourse delivered at Leipzig, July 9, 1858. By Prof. G. V. LECHLER.') Leipzig: 1858.
- (10.) *Die Vorreformatoren des vierzehnten und funfzehnten Jahrhunderts, Erste Hälfte: Johannes von Wycliffe.* Von FRIEDRICH BÖHRINGER. ('The Forerunners of the Reformation in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.' First Part.)
- (11.) *The Character and Place of Wickliffe as a Reformer.* By HERBERT COWELL, of Wadham College. J. and G. Parker. Oxford.

THE volume placed first in the list of works at the head of this article, is one of a series in course of publication under the sanction of the Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury, at the suggestion of the Master of the Rolls. The works thus published are to consist of 'materials for the history of this country from the invasion by the Romans to the reign of 'Henry VIII.' Hitherto the publication of documents relating to English history under the direction of our government has gone on so slowly as to exhaust the patience of the student, and to be far from satisfactory to the public. And when such works have made their appearance, it has generally been in forms so costly as to place them beyond the reach of the great majority of the persons likely to make the best use of them, by rendering it necessary that they should be consulted, for the most part, only in large public libraries. The Master of the Rolls has avoided these errors. By the employment of a sufficient number of competent

editors, he hopes to send forth as many as twelve volumes in a year. It is a part of his plan also that these volumes shall be published at a price which may allow of their finding a place in the libraries of scholars who do not often purchase very expensive works. Mr. Shirley's volume extends to more than six hundred handsomely printed royal octavo pages, it is strongly and even elegantly bound, and may be purchased for 8s. 6d.

We scarcely need say, that in this matter the Master of the Rolls, and the Lords of the Treasury, are doing a good work. Our only fear is lest this change from the delays of the past, as regards the rate of publication, to the speed of the present, should be found greater than will consist with due care and accuracy. In Mr. Shirley's volume there are not a few signs of haste which we shall have occasion to notice, and which may suffice to show the ground of our apprehension in this particular.

The manuscript volume from which Mr. Shirley has made his selections has been long known to scholars, and has already served the purposes of history to a large extent. Though described as *Wycliffe's Treatises*, it consists in only a small degree of papers by Wycliffe, and only partially of papers relating to him. But it shows largely what the opponents of Wycliffe thought of him, and of his real or supposed disciples—the Lollards. The first hundred pages in this volume are occupied by a Carmelite friar named Cunningham, with arguments directed against certain metaphysical and scholastic speculations attributed to Wycliffe. Something more than another hundred pages are assigned to two monks, named Tyssington and Winterton, who wrote in reply to Wycliffe's *Confession on the Eucharist*. In what remains, there is about a hundred pages which may be said to concern Wycliffe directly. About half this space is filled with papers from the pen of Wycliffe. But these papers have all been printed, entirely or in their substance, before, with the exception of the one in which the Reformer replies to Cunningham. The fifty pages remaining, consist of documents which are well known, and which might have been seen *in extenso*, or in their substance, by turning to the printed pages of such writers as Walsingham, Foxe, and Collier, before they made their appearance in the Appendix to Lewis's *Life of Wiclif*.

The merit of Mr. Shirley accordingly is not the merit of a discoverer. But he has done good service in editing this volume. He has given us documents together which are not so found elsewhere; and he has given one or two of them for the first time in completeness, and carefully collated, so that, as far as those papers are concerned, we need not depend any longer on extracts, abridgments, or second-hand information. It should be

added that the papers by Cunningham, Tyssington, and Winter-ton, though well known to be existing in manuscript, have not been printed before, and the question naturally comes as to the value that should be attached to these two hundred pages of new material. It must be at once obvious that we are not at liberty to judge of the opinions of the Reformer from such polemical representations of them. He often complains of being grossly misunderstood and misrepresented by his assailants. The historical worth of such documents accordingly is limited—we may say very limited. They have their uses, but there are points on which they may require to be used with great caution. Taken alone, their authority must be small. But it is otherwise with Wycliffe's reply to Cunningham. In this defence of himself Wycliffe states his own case, as he does in his *Confession on the Eucharist*. This reply is the only contribution in this collection from the pen of Wycliffe that Mr. Shirley has been the first to print; and unfortunately the disputation throughout this paper is of a sort to be little interesting to modern readers, affording small help in respect to what we most wish to know concerning its author. Cunningham's papers are, as we have said, wholly metaphysical and scholastic, and such is the character of Wycliffe's reply. In the dispute as here presented there is nothing to prepare us for what was to follow. For anything that is here said, Wycliffe might have lived and died no more a reformer than Bradwardine or Duns Scotus. It is of course no fault of Mr. Shirley's if these documents do next to nothing towards enlarging or correcting the views of well-informed men concerning the life or the doctrine of our great Reformer. Such, at all events, is the fact. After a careful examination of this volume, we find ourselves at the same point on this subject. We may feel our footing a little more firmly, but our footing is where it was.

What we have said in favour of this volume relates exclusively to the papers which Mr. Shirley has edited. The sketch of the Life and Times of the Reformer which precedes the documents is another affair. We should have been glad if we could have spoken as favourably of this part of Mr. Shirley's labours as of what follows. But this we cannot do. Nothing can be imagined in worse taste—more unsuitable or unjust—than that works of this nature should be used to give expression, and factitious influence, to personal prejudices and party feeling. These publications are issued at the cost of the nation. They are meant to serve the interest of the nation. Future generations are expected to read them and study them, and they will so do. If used to give vent to the spleen of sects or coteries, either political or religious, the

dignity of their true position is sacrificed. The national feeling is lost—a sectional feeling comes into its place; and the assailant secures a position for his attack, which cannot be ceded to any rejoinder, however reasonable or just. To an honourable mind, the last consideration alone should be enough to preclude all controversial matter, as far as possible, from such publications. The editors of the works published of late years from our national archives, and we may mention especially the learned editors of Wycliffe's Bible, have been religiously observant of these considerations, and have not disgraced themselves or their country when so employed by sinking the Englishman in the bigot. The Master of the Rolls and the Lords of the Treasury seem to have been alike aware that the manifestation of any such feeling by the editors to be employed by them would be most unseemly, and no doubt flattered themselves that they had guarded effectually against it. The judgment of the Master of the Rolls was—

‘That each chronicle or document to be edited should be treated in the same way as if the editor were engaged on an *Editio Princeps*; and for this purpose the most correct text should be formed from an accurate collation of the best MSS.

‘To render the work more generally useful, the Master of the Rolls suggested that the editor should give an account of the MSS. employed by him, of their age and their peculiarities; that he should add to the work a brief account of the life and times of the author, and any remarks *necessary to explain the chronology; but no other note or comment was to be allowed, except what might be necessary to establish the correctness of the text.*

#### The Lords of the Treasury

--‘expressed their approbation of the proposal that each chronicle and historical document should be edited in such a manner as to present with all possible correctness the text of each writer, derived from a collation of the best MSS., and that *no notes should be added, except such as were illustrative of the various readings.* They suggested, however, that the preface to each work should contain, in addition to the particulars proposed by the Master of the Rolls, a biographical account of the author, as far as authentic materials existed for that purpose, and an estimate of his historical credibility and value.’

Of course, if so much care was taken to secure that the text should not be used as an occasion on which to hang things irrelevant, unnecessary, or controversial, the same principle would apply to anything in the shape of a memoir to precede it. Indeed, Mr. Shirley himself seems to have been in a measure aware of the propriety of this course, inasmuch as in one instance he avowedly passes by a topic which lay in his path, on the ground

that 'it would involve a controversy, which in these pages would be misplaced.'—('Introduction,' lx.) Had Mr. Shirley been duly mindful of this principle, he would have felt that in his sketch of the Life of Wycliffe it became him to tell his own story as he best could, and not to go out of his way to place himself, and that by the help of sneers and misrepresentations, in an attitude of antagonism to men who have travelled the same ground before him. Of course it is open to Mr. Shirley to indulge in this kind of authorship to any extent that may be agreeable to him, on his own responsibility; but it is not open to him to write in this manner in publications of the description to which his name is in this instance attached.

Mr. Shirley begins his narrative in the Niebuhr manner, by doubting what most people have believed. There is a fashion in such things, as in much beside. In the case of Mr. Shirley this sceptical tendency follows naturally from his proneness to depreciate the labours of his predecessors. Nearly everything he touches is somehow found to be a matter on which the right thing has not been done. Hallam, Sismondi, Thierry, Guizot, and others, have done their best to make themselves familiar with the mind of the Middle Age. But after all, the literary history of that age, it seems, has yet to be written. Of all the periods in English history before the accession of Henry VIII., perhaps the age of Edward III. is the most interesting to Englishmen, and the best understood by them. But even that history, we are assured, is an untold tale. Much has been done of late years to assist inquirers in the study of the scholastic philosophy. But according to Mr. Shirley, the historian of the scholastic philosophy is still to come. Nothing is easier than to write in this manner. It is to take very high ground at very little cost. For many persons are thus led to think, with one of Mr. Shirley's friendly critics, that the man, in such cases, 'who most keenly feels the want, is in all probability the best qualified to supply it.\*' We do not mean to say that Mr. Shirley may not be the man to give us the literary history of the Middle Age, the history of the reign of Edward III., or the account of the old schoolman philosophy, which the world still wants. We only venture to say that it is not often safe to cede reputation on the supposition of what a man *may* do. What has he *done*? We should further observe that Mr. Shirley, in several instances, expresses surprise that the biographers of Wycliffe should not have seen certain things which he points out as overlooked, though noteworthy, while in fact those things have been seen by

\* *Quarterly Review*, No. 207, p. 151.

others before, quite as clearly as by Mr. Shirley now, and it is not the fault of Wycliffe's biographers if they are not well known. But more of this presently.

While such is the general tone of Mr. Shirley's writing about Wycliffe and his times, it will not be supposed that so severe a censor has allowed the professed biographers of the Reformer to go free. Mr. Lewis, the first in this series, is much favoured; but even his work, according to Mr. Shirley, does no credit to the University press, and as a literary performance it is pronounced 'very poor.' It is saved, apparently, on the ground of the documents which make up its appendix. But the labours of Dr. Vaughan in this field seem to be very unwelcome. It is clear that Mr. Shirley would extrude that gentleman from this ground altogether—were it possible. There are two notes in Mr. Shirley's 'Introduction' (pp. xvi., xxxiv.) in which references are made to Dr. Vaughan, concerning which we have a word to say. In the first of these notes—and we speak advisedly—Mr. Shirley asserts as *true*, what he could not *know* to be true, and what is *untrue*. In reply to the second note, it is sufficient to say that Dr. Vaughan is not in 'complete ignorance' of the Oxford MS., *De Veritate Scripture*, the note to which Mr. Shirley himself refers being proof to the contrary; and that he has *not* affected a knowledge of that MS. which he does not possess, but has taken care in that same note to guard his readers against mistake on that point.\* In the language of these two notes Mr. Shirley has conveyed three ideas in reference to Dr. Vaughan, all three of which are false, all three of which are meant to be damaging—as damaging as possible. What is more, to do the unlaible in this manner Mr. Shirley has gone quite out of his way. There was no more need that what is said should have been said at all, than that it should have been said with a sneer. The notes are such as we do not expect from a scholar—there is insult in them both. But such, it seems, is the taste of the 'tutor of Wadham' in things of this nature †

After this it is hardly surprising that Mr. Shirley should speak of Mr. Lewis's book, 'very poor' though it be, as being still our best Life of Wycliffe; and of Mr. Baber's catalogue of the Re-

\* *John de Wycliffe, D.D. A Monograph.* Pp. 536, 537.

† Dr. Todd, the librarian of Trinity College, Dublin, expressing his regret that so little is known of the work by Wycliffe intitled *De Veritate Scripture*, thus describes the copy of it in that collection. 'This ignorance, I must candidly confess, it is not in my power to remove; for although the volume which is the subject of it, is now actually open before me, yet it is written in a hand so fearfully abbreviated, that it would deter a more skilful diplomatist than myself from attempting its perusal, unless he had much more time for the task than I can command. . . . I had intended quoting the whole of the summary of one or two chapters, in order to give the reader some idea of the work, but I find some words so abbre-

former's works, as being still our best guide on that subject. These assertions are the expressions of mere opinion, and are worthy of notice simply from the amount of prejudice which they betray—prejudice which would be merely ridiculous but for the graver element which underlies it.

But since comparisons *are* to be made, let them be made. For reasons which will be understood by some of our readers, Dr. Vaughan's *Monograph* has never been reviewed in these pages, and his labours generally in relation to this subject have been left, so far as the *British Quarterly Review* is concerned, to the independent estimation of the public. If we now undertake to show what the state of our literature really was in regard to

viated as to require more time than I can at present conveniently spare for deciphering them.'—*British Magazine*, June, 1835. Dr. Vaughan has spoken of the Oxford copy of this work, which in these respects is the counterpart of that in Dublin, as difficult to decipher, and almost unreadable, and this has exposed him to another sneer from Mr. Shirley. ('Introduction' xxxiv.) Dr. Todd further says of the MS. in Dublin,—'It is not a complete work in itself, as has hitherto been supposed, but a part, and as I would say, about a third part of a great system of scholastic divinity, written in all the barbarity of language, and with all the formidable array of distinctions and divisions which are now regarded as the opprobrium of the schoolmen.' Dr. James, the librarian of the Bodleian in the time of James I., published a small work intitled *An Apologie for John Wycliffe* in which he printed passages from the MS. *De Veritate Scripturæ*, and he left in MS. in the same library considerable extracts from that work, extending to nearly a hundred small quarto pages, made with his own hand. Dr. Vaughan confesses (*Monograph*, p. 537) in common with Dr. Todd, to his difficulty in attempting to read this work, and states distinctly that his acquaintance with it does not extend beyond a general inspection of it, and an endeavour to transcribe and translate certain parts of it. He spoke of it, as he says, more from Dr. James's extracts than from his own examination; and if he spoke of it quite as favourably as those extracts would warrant, it was in the hope that before now some scholar, with the position and leisure requisite to such an undertaking, might have been disposed to do something towards making it better known. The man who should pretend to have read everything it is desirable to read in relation to Wycliffe, without having given no small part of a life to it, would only betray his insincerity or his weakness. Mr. Shirley is a resident in Oxford, and has been largely aided in his labours by the learned sub-librarian of the Bodleian, the Rev. F. O. Cox, a gentleman, it seems, to whom he is indebted for 'whatever knowledge he possesses of mediæval manuscripts.' In such circumstances Mr. Shirley ought to be able to give a good account of the contents of the *De Veritate Scripturæ*—and it would be something to be the first man that has so done. It is strange that Dr. Vaughan should be described as affecting to have read a work which he is accused of describing as 'unreadable.' Truth is consistent. Mr. Lewis describes the MS. in Oxford as beginning with the words '*Restat parumper discutere errores*' (p. 190;) but these words do not occur at the beginning of the Oxford MS., nor do they occur as initial words in any subsequent part of the work.

Mr. Shirley is careful to refer his readers to Dr. Todd's attacks on Dr. Vaughan; why is he silent about the reply to those attacks? He knew of both, and surely it would be as easy for the student to turn to the *Eclectic Review*, (January, 1843,) as to the defunct *British Magazine*. One of Dr. Todd's assertions was, that 'all' the Wycliffe MSS. in Dublin had their place in a printed catalogue before Dr. Vaughan called attention to them. On examination it was found that the 'all' in this case consisted of eight out of sixty! So recklessly can some learned gentlemen write when their object is to damage Dr. Vaughan.



Wycliffe when Dr. Vaughan took up the subject, and what, his contribution to it has been, it will, we trust, be seen that this is a course to which we have been constrained. We have not chosen it.

Every student of English history will be aware that even before the decease of Wycliffe, the political feeling, and the state of political parties in this country, which had been for a time so favourable to the purposes of the Reformer, were greatly changed. One effect of this coming change we see in his retirement from Oxford to his rectory at Lutterworth; and he there employed himself in preaching, in translating the Bible into English, in multiplying his English tracts and treatises, and in encouraging the labours of the itinerant preachers—such as Purvey and Ash-ton—often mentioned by him under the name of ‘poor priests.’ If his voice was no longer to be heard in Oxford, he knew how to make himself felt more than ever among the people, from one end of the country to the other. From this time it was among the people, and for the most part among the humbler classes of them, that his doctrines were to vegetate. On the accession of the house of Lancaster, the hierarchy regained much of its power. The men at the head of the state were not men disposed towards innovation in religious matters. Learning, religion, morals, social liberty, all continued to deteriorate, until the turbulent interval extending from the reign of Henry IV. to that of Henry VIII. had passed away. The peasant and the yeoman, the burgher and the merchant, retained some memory of Wycliffe, and secreted and read his books. But when the Reformation came, it was a reformation springing from new circumstances and new passions, and was founded on principles widely different from those which Wycliffe had promulgated. The bleeding remnant of his followers which still survived, did much to help forward that change, but the reforming statesmen who flourished under the Tudors had no motive that could dispose them to recall the name of Wycliffe—rather the contrary. The first protest against Romanism was soon followed by the struggle between the high church Anglicans and the Puritans, which issued at length in the memorable strife between Parliamentarians and Royalists. In none of these changes, nor in those which followed on the Restoration, was there anything to make the contending parties at all curious about the opinions of Wycliffe. Enough was known to make all parties aware that he was not with any of them more than in part; and in those times of strong party demarcations, this circumstance alone was enough to lead to what happened. No party could use the name of Wycliffe as a watchword, and accordingly, as by tacit consent, all were prepared to pass him by.

Such has been the fate of Wycliffe’s memory in our history.

Nevertheless, if some of our modern German historians are to be credited, Huss and Jerome were little more than echoes of Wycliffe, and if so, then Luther and Melancthon may be claimed as his children, however insensible they may themselves have been to the fact of such a genealogy.

But the Reformation, and especially the dissolution of the monasteries, threw a large quantity of manuscripts abroad. Bishop Bale, Archbishop Parker, and Archbishop Ussher, are entitled to special commendation for the care with which they possessed themselves of such treasures, and deposited them where they might be of service in time to come. Foxe the martyrologist made use of the manuscripts relating to Wycliffe which Bale had collected, especially of the collection of papers from which the pieces in Mr. Shirley's volume are selected. But the most valuable collection of manuscript works written by Wycliffe himself, were those collected by Archbishop Parker, and deposited in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; and those collected by Archbishop Ussher, and deposited after his decease in the library of Trinity College, Dublin. Down to the beginning of the last century, however, not a vestige of use had been made of the Parker manuscripts at Cambridge, and even then the use made of them by Mr. Lewis was much less thorough than might have been expected, as will be presently shown. While in regard to the Ussher manuscripts in Dublin, though among the most valuable that have been preserved to us, they were not known, for the greater part, as being in existence, until Dr. Vaughan called public attention to them.

It is this long neglect of everything relating to Wycliffe in England, though himself so great an Englishman, that has made it so difficult in these later times to gratify the curiosity of a wiser public by furnishing trustworthy information concerning him. As a nation we may well lament that the place of the great Reformer in our history should be so much a place apart and alone, and that what we now know of him, or can hope to know, falls so much below what we wish to know. But we have ourselves to thank for this state of things. We owe it to those narrow bigotries which have been so rife among us from the days of Wycliffe to our own.

But what is our present knowledge with regard to the writings of this extraordinary man? Mr. Shirley says that the introduction to Mr. Baber's reprint of what was supposed to be Wycliffe's New Testament 'contains the best catalogue yet given of Wycliffe's works' (530). A few sentences on this point will suffice to test Mr. Shirley's claims to caution and accuracy on matters of this nature.

The earliest attempt to furnish a list of the Reformer's writings was made by Bishop Bale, in his *Illustrium Majoris Britannie Scriptorum Summarium*, printed in 1518. The catalogue there given includes one hundred and two titles, with the mention of the opening words of the MSS. in thirty-four instances, but without reference as to where any MS. in the list might be found. Many of the works in this catalogue are now among the best known productions of the Reformer, and are of much value, others are still known only by their titles. Mr. Lewis's list was not published until two centuries later. It is a great improvement on that of his predecessor. It had now become comparatively easy to ascertain what MSS. of this description existed in the libraries of the English universities, in the King's Library, and in some other collections. Mr. Lewis's titles of works amount to two hundred and eighty, and under some of these titles several distinct pieces are included. But it should be added, that more than half of these titles are titles of the same works, or of works which have either perished or are unknown. Of the remaining MSS. the opening words are generally given, as well as the title, and sometimes—though very rarely—an indication as to their contents, and it is quite as rare to find any indication as to when they were written. Mr. Baber's catalogue was published in 1810. It ought to have been a great improvement on that published by Mr. Lewis. But it is not. It is much less full, and some of its omissions are very material. For instance, fully a third of the MSS. in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, mentioned by Mr. Lewis, are overlooked by Mr. Baber. To the MSS. in Trinity College, Cambridge, Mr. Baber has not made a single reference. One of the volumes in the last-named collection consists of a folio of nearly a hundred and fifty closely written pages, including thirteen discussions or treatises, on so many different topics, several of these being pieces which, so far as we know, will not be found elsewhere. Here are the contents of this volume as printed by Mr. Lewis, and as reprinted by Dr. Vaughan, who has added the paging of the volume to indicate the comparative length of the several papers:—

'1. DE ENTE COMMUNI. In primis supponitur ens esse, hoc enim non probari potest nec ignorari ab aliquo. Fol. 1—5. 2. DE ENTE PRIMO. Extenso ente secundum ejus maximam ampliationem, possibile est venari in tanto ambitu ens primum. Folio 5—9. 3. DE PURGANDO ERRORES, ET VERITATE IN COMMUNI. Consequens et purgare errores. Fol. 9—15. 4. DE PURGANDO ERRORES ET UNIVERSALIBUS IN COMMUNI. Tractatu continentur dicta de universalibus. Folio 15—23. 5. DE UNIVERSALIBUS. Tractatus de universalibus continet 16 capitula cujus primum. Folio 23—37. 6. DE TEMPORE. In tractando de tempore sunt aliqua ex dictis superius

capienda. Folio 37—47. DE INTELLECTIONE DEI. Illorum quæ insunt Deo communiter, quædam insunt sibi soli. Folio 47—53. 8. DE SCIENTIA DEI. Ex dictis superius satis liquet quod scientiam quam Deus. Folio 53—70. 9. DE VOLITIONE DEI. Tractando de volitione Dei quam oportet ex dictis supponere. Folio 70—91. 10. DE PERSONARUM DISTINCTIONE. Superest investigare de distinctione et convenientia personarum quas credimus plena fide. Folio 91—115. 11. DE IDEIS. Tractando de ideis primo oportet querere si sunt. Folio 115—122. 12. DE POTENTIA PRODUCTIVA DEI. Veritatum quas Deus non potest renovare. Folio 122—131. 13. DE SERMONE DOMINI, in three parts. Licet totum Evangelium.—Fol. 131—141. —*Monograph*, 541.

The reader will feel that omissions extending to MSS. of this magnitude and importance are a grave matter. The truth is, the only advantage in Mr. Baber's catalogue over that of Mr. Lewis that is worth notice, consists in the reference made by the help of Denis's printed catalogue of the Imperial Library at Vienna, to MSS. existing in that collection which are attributed to the Reformer. But information concerning the titles of supposed Wycliffe MSS., at Vienna, is a poor compensation for the want of the information that might have been given concerning MSS. nearer home. Mr. Baber's account of the MSS. British Museum is valuable. It is well also to know, as far as we may, what is in a library so little accessible as the Imperial Library of Vienna; but, on the whole, Mr. Baber's catalogue, in place of being the best as compared with Dr. Vaughan's (which is what is meant), is not the best as compared with that published by Mr. Lewis more than a century since. As Mr. Baber ought to have produced a fuller and more satisfactory catalogue than Mr. Lewis, so Dr. Vaughan ought to have produced a fuller and a more satisfactory one than either; and we cannot help thinking that he has done so. But of this our readers shall have the means of judging.

Dr. Vaughan had before him what Mr. Lewis had done, and what Mr. Baber had done. What addition has he made to those acquisitions? In the first place, he has done something to confirm the representations made by those writers by his fuller examination of some of the MSS. to which they refer—by presenting frequent analyses of their contents, with copious and characteristic extracts, and in many instances by determining, not only their authorship, but their dates. He has also shown that some of the pieces attributed to Wycliffe, and printed as being his, are certainly not his. He has, moreover, added to the series of Wycliffe MSS., which were known to be in existence when Mr. Baber concluded his labours, an extended list of which the best informed at that time had no knowledge. The following

are the titles of the MSS. which Dr. Vaughan has added to the previous lists:—

'1. DE HYPOCRITARUM IMPOSTURIS. 2. DE OBEDIENTIA PRELATORUM. 3. DE CONVERSATIONE ECCLESIASTICORUM. 4. SPECULUM DE ANTICHRISTO. 5. OF CLERKS POSSESSIONERS. 6. DE XXXIII. ERRORIBUS CURATORUM. 7. OF THE ORDER OF PRIESTHOOD. 8. DE PRECATIONIBUS SACRIS. 9. DE EPISCOPORUM ERRORIBUS. 10. IMPEDIMENTA EVANGELIZANTIIUM. 11. DE DOMINIS ET SERVIS. 12. DE DIABOLO ET MEMBRIS. 13. FOR THREE SKILLS LORDS SHOULD CONSTRAIN CLERKS TO LIVE IN MEEKNESS. 14. DE DOMINIS DIVINO. 15. OF PERFECT LIFE. 16. THE SEVEN DEADLY SINS. 17. DE ECCLESIE DOMINIS. 18. OF THE TEMPTATIONS OF THE FIEND. 19. HOW MEN OF PRIVATE RELIGION SHOULD LOVE MORE THE GOSPEL OF GOD'S RESTS, &c. 20. TRACTATUS EVANGELII DE SERMONE DOMINI IN MONTE. 21. EXPOSITIO ORATIONIS DOMINICÆ. 22. TRACTATUS DE ANTICHRISTO. 23. EXPOSITIO IN XXIII. XXIV. XXV. CAP. ST. MATTHEW. 24. TRACTATUS DE STATU INNOCENTIE. 25. TRACTATUS DE TEMPORE. 25. DE CAPTIVO HISPANENSIS—FILIA COMITIS DE DENE INCARCERATO INFRA SEPTA WESTMONAST. 26. THE CREED, THE PATERNOSTER, AND THE AVE MARIA. 27. OF THE SEVEN HERESIES. 28. OF THE DECALOGUE. 29. OF FAITH, HOPE, AND CHARITY. 30. OF THE SEVEN WORKS OF BOBILY MERCY. 31. OPERA CHARITATIS. 31. SEPTEN PECCATA CAPITALIA. 32. DE ECCLESIA ET MEMBRIS EJUS. 33. DE APOSTASIA ET DOTATIONE ECCLESIE. 34. TRACTATUS DE PSEUDO FRERIS. 35. EGRESSUS JESUS DE TEMPLO. 36. OF ANTICHRIST AND HIS MEYNEE (lately printed by Dr. Todd, but not Wycliffe's), 37. OF ANTICHRIST'S SONG IN THE CHURCH. 38. OF PRAYER—A TREATISE. 39. NOTA DE CONFESIONE. 40. CHRIST FORSOOTH DID ALL THAT HE COULD TO OBEY LORDS. 41. NOTA DE SACRAMENTO ALTARIS. 42. CHRYSOSTOM SAITH THAT FISHERS AND BUYSTOUSE MEN, MAKING EACH DAY NETS. 43. NEITHER MAN NOR WOMAN MAY PERFECTLY DO THE SEVEN WORKS OF MERCY. 44. CLERKS KNOW THAT MAN HATH FIVE WITS OUTWARD. 45. HOW ARE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS PUT THAT ARE WRITTEN HEREAFTER (extends to forty leaves, has been since printed by Dr. Todd). 46. IT IS WRITTEN IN HOLY WRIT THAT THERE WERE THREE PATRIARCHS. 47. THESE BE THE NINE POINTS THAT THE LORD JESUS ANSWERED A HOLY MAN. 48. OF THE DEEDS OF MERCY GOD WILL SPEAK AT THE DREADFUL DAY.'

Here, then, is a list of some FIFTY MSS., large and small, all existing in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, and all attributed to Wycliffe, not one of which has been mentioned as existing there in any publication whatever until they were all inserted in the list of the Reformer's writings published by Dr. Vaughan. In 1827, when Dr. Vaughan was engaged in these researches, there was no printed catalogue to the Dublin MSS.,

and no one could examine them except under the eye of a fellow of the college. They were, in consequence, unknown at a distance, and no one having ready access to them had been disposed to examine them. Mr. Baber remarks that much of the value of any list of the Reformer's writings must depend on the care taken to name 'the place where any manuscript work is to be found, and the language in which it is written.' (p. xxxviii.) It must also be obvious that such a catalogue will be good, not only in proportion to the number of MSS. it includes that may be accounted unique, but to its number of existing duplicate manuscripts. We feel bound to say, however, that Mr. Baber's catalogue is remarkably faulty according to his own idea of what it ought to have been. Not to notice lesser omissions, it gives no account, as we have seen, of the manuscripts in Trinity College, Cambridge—a considerable series. It omits quite a third of the Wycliffe MSS. in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge—the most valuable collection in the kingdom. It mentions six only of this class of MSS. as to be found in Trinity College, Dublin—while the number existing there is between fifty and sixty. Dr. Vaughan's catalogue contains everything to be found in Mr. Baber's; it is full in its account of the MSS. in Cambridge; and it stands alone in its account of the nearly FIFTY MSS. above enumerated which are in Dublin, and it includes the results of Dr. Todd's subsequent examination of those MSS. along with his own.\* Yet Mr. Shirley can coolly tell the future students of English history that Mr. Baber's list is 'the best that has yet been given to the public'! How is this to be explained? Is it done in ignorance? Or is it done wittingly? In either case, what value can attach after this to any assertion that Mr. Shirley may make on points of this description? Not the LEAST.

We think we shall make it appear, in the next place, that the comparison made in reference to Mr. Lewis's *Life of Wiclif* is about as just as the assertion made in reference to Mr. Baber's catalogue of the Reformer's works. We have seen how the course of events in our history tended to divert the attention of Englishmen from enquiries concerning the services and character of Wycliffe down to the beginning of the eighteenth century. It was greatly to the credit of Mr. Lewis to attempt what he did on this subject at that time. Bishop Bale, John Foxe, Dr. James, Fuller, Collier, and Anthony Wood, were his chief precursors in this path since the Reformation. Such documents as had appeared in print, and some that existed only in manuscript—

\* *John de Wycliffe, a Monograph.* Appendix, pp. 525—544. *Tracts and Treatises of John de Wycliffe, D.D., with Selections and Translations.* Edited by Robert Vaughan, D.D. 1844. pp. 1—79.

especially in the volume from which Mr. Shirley has made his selections—were more or less pointed out to Mr. Lewis by those writers. Mr. Lewis very naturally availed himself of their guidance, and brought together a number of papers already in print, and with them several valuable contributions from manuscripts. The following is Mr. Lewis's account of the assistance he obtained in this good work:—

‘By the favour of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, I had the perusal of Wiclif's *Triologus*, and of a volume of MSS., which his Grace had transcribed for his use from the Bodleian Library. His Grace's librarian, the learned Dr. Wilkins, was so kind as himself to copy for me the process of the dispute between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Dr. Wiclif about the Wardenship of Canterbury Hall. To my faithful friend, Dr. Elias Sydal, canon of Christchurch, Canterbury, I owe the having had the liberty of making use of whatever is in the library of that church for my purpose. The copy of the collection of Wiclif's English MSS., in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, of which I have made so much use, was procured for me by the Rev. Mr. Charles Sheldrake, fellow of that college. The account of the other MSS. in the libraries at Cambridge, I had by the favour and the kind assistance of the Rev. Thomas Denn, fellow of the same college. What account I have had of the MSS. in Ireland, I thankfully acknowledge to have received it from the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Kilmore, and the Rev. Dr. Howard, Fellow of Trinity College, near Dublin.’—Preface xv.

The papers transcribed for Mr. Lewis from the Registry in Canterbury, touching the matter of Canterbury Hall, were not, it seems, transcribed very accurately, and they added little to what was before known.\* We have seen in part how scanty was the information supplied from Ireland. In Oxford, Mr. Lewis no doubt examined for the most part for himself, and what he knew of real value about the Cambridge MSS. he knew in the same way. It is not pleasant to say anything to the disadvantage of a man whose intentions were so good, and whose labours were in many respects so praiseworthy, and, we may add, so valuable. But it has not been ours to force comparisons in relation to him. We shall, however, only advert to one or two points, for the purpose of showing that something better than Mr. Lewis had done on this subject was desirable, and that something better has been accomplished.

Mr. Lewis's chief merit was that of a collector of materials. His German critics say that his book can hardly be called a life, that it should rather be described as consisting of materials for a

\* Seeley's Edition of *Foxe*, edited by the Rev. Josiah Pratt. Vol. ii. App. pp. 922--938.

life. . But even in this view its defects are sometimes serious. In a work printed in Oxford in 1697, intitled, *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Anglie et Hibernie*—a work by the way which answers but poorly to its title—is the following entry concerning MSS. in Trinity College, Dublin. ‘No. 814. *Jno. Wickliffe’s Works to the Duke of Lancaster in 1368.* Quarto. Parch.’ It must be remembered that the year 1368 was only two years after the discussion about the King John tribute, and nine years before Wycliffe’s appearance with the Duke of Lancaster and the Earl Marshal in St. Paul’s—that is, nine years before the first open movement of authority against him on account of his opinions and teaching. Now we surely might have supposed that one of the first efforts of a man intending to write a Life of Wycliffe would be to make himself acquainted with this volume. Its supposed date made a knowledge of its contents most important; and its being dedicated to a layman and a statesman seemed to promise that it would be of great practical worth. Mr. Lewis does get one or two brief extracts from one piece in this volume—but how the volume has come to be described as *John Wickliffe’s Works to the Duke of Lancaster*, and how this tract, written evidently in 1368, from which he gets his extracts, has come to be attributed to Wycliffe, he never learns. This significant title, ‘*John Wickliffe’s Works to the Duke of Lancaster in 1368,*’ is handed down without questioning in Mr. Lewis’s narrative for the next hundred years, and it is copied in all directions during that interval. That Mr. Lewis should have been content to leave this matter in such a posture, is evidence enough, we think, that to do what needed to be done for the memory of Wycliffe demanded some attention to the subject beyond what Mr. Lewis had been able to bestow upon it.

Dr. Vaughan examined this manuscript volume for himself. He found that the title, *Jno. Wickliffe’s Works to the Duke of Lancaster in 1368*, was no part of the original manuscript; that this title is written upon one of the pieces by another and a much later hand; that the piece on which it happens to be written bears internal evidence of having been written not earlier than 1381; and concerning the one short tract which was evidently written in 1368, and from which Mr. Lewis gets his brief extracts, Dr. Vaughan’s ultimate opinion is that it ought not to be attributed to Wycliffe at all. On this last point Mr. Shirley is of Dr. Vaughan’s judgment; concerning the other points he can have no judgment, for he has no knowledge.

On a subject of this nature, next in importance to the industry and enterprise which brings home material, is the discernment which knows how to make the best use of it when obtained.



In this respect, Mr. Lewis's ability—to use Mr. Shirley's expression—is 'very poor.' There are men who become manifestly rich by their acquisitions, and there are men who are not so much enriched as bewildered by them. The power to arrange, construct, and build up is not their power. In a life, there should be what belongs to all life—progress. Development, and how that development has been brought about, belong to the essence of such a theme. But Mr. Lewis had no such conception of his work. What Wycliffe did, what happened to him, in this year or that—these ideas as relating to mere matters of fact, Mr. Lewis could in some sort apprehend, but his intelligence rarely goes beyond that limit. To look at these facts in their relation to growth, and especially in their relation to the growth of such a mind as Wycliffe's, was not at all in his way. He did not attempt it—it becomes ridiculous to think of him as attempting it.

The original material in relation to Wycliffe that was most familiar to Mr. Lewis, was the collection of the Reformer's English works preserved in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. But the plan on which he has used those documents is most unsatisfactory and misleading. He has contented himself with culling a few extracts from them which are meant to illustrate a few of the Reformer's opinions. It might have been supposed that Mr. Lewis would at once have seen that the value of all such extracts for the purposes of biography would depend very much on what might be known as to *when* those opinions were avowed, or *when* those feelings were expressed, so as to allow of their being estimated in relation to their antecedents and circumstances. But scarcely a thought of this kind would seem to have entered the mind of Mr. Lewis. With a little effort for the purpose he might have ascertained the date of nearly all those English treatises—certainly of the more important among them. Fortunately, the sermons of Wycliffe, and most of his English works, are pregnant with allusions to passing events. Mr. Lewis might have carefully marked all such allusions, and by thus fixing the dates of the several works he might have presented them as indications of the growth of the man in its season. But Mr. Lewis does nothing of the kind. Without care about dates, without attempting to set forth the general contents of such works, it is enough for him to show from them that Dr. Wycliffe taught or believed thus and thus, but whether the Wycliffe who so taught and believed was the Wycliffe of thirty years of age, of fifty, or of sixty, is a point which does not seem to have presented itself to his mind as of any great importance. We shall give an illustration.

Wycliffe's return from the negotiation with the Papal Commis-

sioners at Bruges belongs to the year 1374. Mr. Lewis, speaking of the Reformer's disappointment at the result of that embassy, says, that, 'on his return he did all he could to expose the pride; covetousness, ambition, and tyranny of the Pope.' (P. 37.) In proof of this statement, passages of a very impassioned description are adduced from four of the Reformer's English treatises, as though they were certainly the productions of that period, while in fact, if he had looked with only ordinary care and intelligence into those writings, he must have seen that they could no one of them have come into existence until some seven or ten years later. They all belong to that closing period of the Reformer's career, when, having withdrawn from Oxford, he gave himself with so much intensity to the translation of the Scriptures, to the labours of the pulpit, and to the multiplication of treatises and tracts in the language of the people.

One of the treatises thus inaptly appealed to by Mr. Lewis is intitled *The Great Sentence of the Curse Expounded*. It is distributed into seventy-nine chapters, and extends to nearly a hundred quarto pages. Its reference to the Papal schism determines that it could not have been written earlier than 1379:—its reference to the war going on in Flanders 'for the love of two false priests who are open Antichrists,' determines that it could not have been written before 1383—while Lewis appeals to it as written on his return to England in 1374, or immediately afterwards. Another of the treatises cited by Mr. Lewis is that intitled *On Prelates*, and here again there is a reference to the war in Flanders under Bishop Spencer, which is said to show that the use of the clerks of Antichrist is 'not to make peace but dissensions and wars.' (C. 13.) A third work so cited is that known under the title of *Servants and Lords*; and the fourth is the well-known treatise named *Of Clerks Possessioners*—both these pieces, from their references to the Reformer's 'poor priests,' and to the persecutions directed against them, could not have been written earlier than 1382. These works accordingly give us the ultimate convictions and feelings of the Reformer, and are no certain guide as to his impressions and opinions so far back as 1374. The proceedings against him at St. Paul's, at Lambeth, and in Oxford were all then to come, and their effect upon him to be realized. Most important, too, is it to bear in mind, that, if Wycliffe had written the works in 1374, which Mr. Lewis has virtually attributed to him at that time, then the articles of impeachment against him in 1377 would hardly have stopped where they did, and, what is more, Wycliffe's defence of himself on that occasion could not be reconciled with honesty. The language of that defence, and the language of these treatises,

could not have come consistently from the same man at the same time. By this inattention to the chronological order of the Reformer's writings, Mr. Lewis has not only failed to do justice to the character of Wycliffe, he has—however unintentionally or unwittingly—done serious injury to his memory. A cast of inconsistency and contradiction has thus been made to rest on his history, of which his enemies have not been slow to take advantage. Dr. Vaughan has been especially careful to guard against negligence in this respect, and unless a host of competent judges have been mistaken, he has thus done for the character and the career of Wycliffe much of the service which it was important some one should have done. He has had the results of Mr. Lewis's inquiries to begin with. He has bestowed not a little time and toil of his own on researches bearing upon this subject. His only competitor has been a man whom even his friends describe as a person of the smallest literary ability. It would, therefore, have been marvellous if, as Mr. Shirley generously intimates, the end of all this had been to leave the subject just as it was. It would be easy to describe in the right words the course which Mr. Shirley has taken on this subject—but it is not worth while.

Mr. Shirley, indeed, intimates that the chronology of Wycliffe's English works can hardly be determined until his earlier Latin works shall have been more carefully examined (p. xlii.). It is easy to see what this means. But such talk is idle. Wycliffe's English works, with rare exceptions, determine their own date, and nothing can disturb the historical conclusions in relation to him which have thus become settled. Enough is known of his earlier Latin works, such as the *De Veritate Scripturæ* and the earlier portions of the *Triologus*, to show that the germs of the reforming thought which are so largely developed in his English works, will be found more or less sown in those somewhat earlier productions—but it will be thought in the germ, as compared with the later growth. We shall not extend these criticisms further. We have said more than we wished to have said about Mr. Baber's catalogue of the Reformer's works, and about Mr. Lewis's volume on his life. Both were highly estimable men, and imperfect as their performances have been, both have a real claim on the gratitude of thoughtful Englishmen.

But it certainly becomes the Master of the Rolls, and the Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury, to consider whether it is fitting that the series of valuable works which they hope to make accessible to the English student at the public cost should be entrusted to men as editors capable of desecrating them, after Mr. Shirley's manner, to the meanest personal and party

purposes. What has prompted the reverend gentleman to write thus it is not for us to divine. We have said enough to indicate how he has acquitted himself in relation to others, and we now proceed to examine what he has himself done to throw light on the life and times of Wycliffe.

Mr. Shirley has found a very kind reviewer in the *Quarterly*. We do not know that the reviewer and the author are personal friends, but it seems very probable. And we must say that we are a little surprised that the authorities who are responsible for these publications, and for the mode in which they come before the public, should deem it proper to occupy the pages of a prospectus with commendatory extracts on the different works from reviews. National publications of this description we should have thought might have been left to the tenor of their way, without seeming to court approval from organs of criticism which have no pretension to the dignity of the national. We should not have adverted to this circumstance were it not obvious that as the editors of these works will all be living literary men, more or less connected with the periodical press, there is some danger lest a tendency towards dealing in that 'splendid traffic' of praise for praise should become prevalent among them. The critic in the review above named sees so completely with the eyes of Mr. Shirley, and when speaking of what that gentleman has done puts the critic so completely in abeyance, that the great purport of the article, in place of being extended to nearly fifty pages, might have been expressed in five lines. Indeed, one line—read Mr. Shirley, and believe everything he says—would have done it all. The reviewer does not sin in the matter of temper as Mr. Shirley does, and is hardly aware perhaps of the amount of unfairness with which he is chargeable. But we are some of us old enough to remember when a writer in that journal was wont to be a person having a mind of his own, and was expected to do something more than endorse the statements of his author. We shall have to show that Mr. Shirley has set forth some very shallow and unwarrantable criticisms about Wycliffe, and that he has used these worthless criticisms as the basis of weighty historical conclusions—but to all these criticisms his reviewer yields what we must regard as a singularly uninquiring and unintelligent assent. In short, the critic in this case would seem to be a quiet, easy gentleman, disposed to do things gently, and well aware that to attempt to go much beneath the surface on a subject of this nature would involve what to most people is a very unwelcome thing—labour. Hence he allows Mr. Shirley to say about Wycliffe's biographers, what a little more thought concerning books he professes to have read must have shown to be untrue. He does venture to tell some

other critics, Dr. Todd among them, that they have not settled accounts with Dr. Vaughan by their meddling with him. He thinks, indeed, that Dr. Vaughan's *Monograph* ought to have been written more in the style of an Oxford sermon, and says that his attempt to give his readers the image and spirit of the times in which Wycliffe had to take his part, is not to his mind. But these are matters of opinion and taste in which there is room for a difference. The reviewer is careful to state—and to state it as though the thought were not only weighty but new—that it would be folly to attempt to write the Life of Wycliffe without doing something considerable to show the state of society generally in his time. Dr. Vaughan has evidently written under this impression, and, we must suppose, to the best of his ability. But while we make no complaint about diversities of taste, it is right to complain when the fruit of honest labour is ignored—as it is in the following passage in this review:—

‘The Reformer retired to his living at Lutterworth, where he passed the remaining two years of his life in an obscurity to which he owes his immunity from further persecution. Yet even thus it is strange that he was suffered to linger out the remains of his days in peace. Tradition says that soon after his retreat he was attacked by paralysis, which ultimately ended his life; but if so, it appears that disease did not at all impair his powers of mind. *The number of his works which must be attributed to this period is prodigious.* To these years of retirement, *besides a multitude of others*, probably belong his tract on the ‘Leaven of the Pharisees,’ directed against the mendicants; and the ‘De Obedientia Prelaturæ’ (*sic*); and also a tract, ‘De Conversatione Ecclesiasticorum,’ which disposes of indulgences, pardons, masses, and all the practical machinery of working the Roman Church.’—p. 145.

The italics in this extract are ours; and we have to ask the reviewer—how do you know that the number of the Reformer's works during those last two years of his life were so prodigious? The answer will probably be—Oh, Mr. Shirley says as much. Yes—but how did Mr. Shirley know that? He could learn nothing of the sort from Mr. Baber, nor from Mr. Lewis, and he does not pretend that his own knowledge of Wycliffe's writings could have given him such information. The truth is, that Mr. Shirley is indebted for his knowledge of this very material fact, as his reviewer upon reflection must see, to the author of a certain *Monograph* of whom both these gentlemen might have spoken differently without much harm to their reputation. The fact is, the writer of the article in question sees discoveries wherever his author sees them, and finds errors wherever he finds them, while in the great majority of instances the discoveries are

not discoveries at all, and the supposed errors are not errors at all. As a further instance of the easy-going style of Mr. Shirley's critic, we may notice that he has printed two or three passages as specimens of Wycliffe's English, but which are taken from a tract with which we feel assured Wycliffe never had anything to do. The following criticism has been published in relation to it:—

'It expresses opinions as to the errors and vices of the entire hierarchy, with the pontiff at its head, which Wycliffe certainly did not publish until within a few years of his decease, and the feeble judgment, and the puerile taste which characterize the whole manner of the performance, forbid my thinking that Wycliffe *could* so have written at that time. By the 'meynee' of antichrist is meant the whole gradation of churchmen, and the religious of all orders and of both sexes; and a rhetorical contrast is instituted in the form of an antithesis between the course pursued by these alleged followers of antichrist, and that pursued by the true disciples of Christ; and this antithesis is extended without interruption through more than five-and-twenty pages, until elaboration and ingenuity, such as they are, can be stretched no further, and the straining and the repetitions become utterly wearisome—Wycliffe was incapable, at any time, of perpetrating such a piece of literary folly.

'The piece abounds, moreover, in words that do not occur in the known writings of Wycliffe—as any one may ascertain by comparing it with the works of the Reformer which have been printed, or with the glossary appended to the Oxford edition of his Bible.

'The omissions, too, in this treatise are significant. In Wycliffe's pieces written after 1381, whatever may be the main topic of them, there are generally such references to the disputes about the Eucharist, or about enabling the people to read the Scriptures in English, as to render it all but certain that in such a striving after the multiplication of the points of difference between the orthodox and their opponents, there would have been large references to these particulars if Wycliffe had been the author.'—*John de Wycliffe, D.D.; a Monograph.* Pp. 539, 540.

Had this criticism come from Mr. Shirley, the reviewer would no doubt have made his selection from some other source. The tract contains references to the favour shown by the prelates towards men able 'to speak fair Latin,' over men distinguished by holiness of life; and also to their persecutions, in which they 'kill men in their prison, pained with hard bonds to make them revoke the truth' (p. cxi.). These allusions are to the persecutions commenced by Courtney in 1382, and which were felt by the Lollards long afterwards. The piece is no doubt the production of a Lollard of the Piers Plowman class, who wrote probably after the Reformer's death, and who did not feel in relation to

the Eucharist controversy, or some other matters, all that Wycliffe felt. This is one of the three *Wycliffe Treatises* published by Dr. Todd; and if the criticism of that gentleman failed to detect its real character, it is perhaps hardly surprising that the writer in the *Quarterly* should have been deceived by it.

Mr. Shirley's criticism on the supposed birthplace of the Reformer may be taken as a fair sample of the manner in which he is disposed to assume to himself more than his due. Leland speaks of the Reformer as born in the parish of Wycliffe on Tees (*Collectanea*, tom. i., part ii., 329), and elsewhere speaks of him as born at Spreswell, 'a good mile from Richmond' (*Itinerary*, v. 99).

'Of the Reformer's origin and birthplace,' says Mr. Shirley, 'Leland, our earliest authority, gives two different accounts, which are perhaps not so irreconcilable as they have been sometimes considered. He says in one passage that he was born at Spreswell, a good mile from Richmond in Yorkshire; in a second, that he drew his origin—'originem duxit'—from the village of Wycliffe, some ten miles distant. He was born, that is, at Spreswell, and was a member of the family of Wyclif of Wyclif.'—p. x.

The impression conveyed by this language, and by that of Mr. Shirley's reviewer, is, that this method of harmonizing the discrepancy in Leland is something new. But this distinction between the place where the Reformer may have been born, and the family home, was suggested by Dr. Vaughan more than a quarter of a century ago.\* The substitution of 'Spreswell' for 'Hipswell,' which Mr. Shirley adopts, is of a much older date; but it is a mere conjecture which adds nothing to our knowledge. This instance of apparent obliviousness as to what other men have done would be a small matter were it not a sample of a series.

The following facts, when taken together, bear more satisfactorily on this point:—There was a William Wycliffe holding a Fellowship in Balliol College in 1361, while John Wycliffe was Master. There was also a John Hugate who was Master in 1366. William Wycliffe, we find, was presented to the living of Wycliffe on Tees in 1363, and John Hugate was presented to that living in 1369, both by John Wycliffe. This interchange of names between Balliol College and Wycliffe on Tees is significant—especially when it is remembered that Balliol College was founded by the ancient Balliol family residing at Bernard Castle,

\* 'It is probable that Leland's information in the two instances was obtained from different sources, the one statement referring perhaps to the family origin of the Reformer, the other to the precise spot of his nativity.'—*Life and Opinions of Wycliffe*, i. 233. Ed. 1831.

not six miles from the parish of Wycliffe. The natural conclusion seems to be, that the Wycliffes of Balliol, both William and John, were Wycliffes of Wycliffe on T'ces. The facts which lead to this conclusion come in part from Whitaker's *Richmondshire* (Art. Wycliffe), and in part from the Rev. Josiah Pratt's valuable notes to Seeley's edition of Foxe (vol. ii. 939, 940; iii. 812).

The earliest documentary evidence of Wycliffe's residence in Oxford is in the Bursar's Compotus of Merton College, which shows John Wycliffe to have been seneschal, or steward for his week, in June 1356. The earliest Compoti of Queen's College, it appears, do not go back further than 1347, and they are for a while imperfect. The first appearance of the name of Wycliffe in such of those entries as are preserved at Queen's is not, it appears, earlier than 1363. From that time, however, the name recurs at intervals until 1380—that is down to the eve of the juncture at which Wycliffe finally withdrew from Oxford to Lutterworth. From this evidence it would seem that if Wycliffe removed at an early period, as is commonly supposed, from Queen's to Merton, he returned after a time to his former residence. It is certain that several of his personal friends were in Queen's during the latter part of his Oxford career. It seems clear, also, that when he withdrew from the University he was of Queen's College; and we have little doubt that there has been evidence for the common opinion of his having commenced his course there, though we had ourselves become aware, before Mr. Pratt made the discovery, that there is no evidence in the records of the college of Wycliffe's connexion with it at so early a period as 1340.

It has been said that, about the year 1360, Wycliffe took up the cause of the University and of the secular clergy against the mendicants, and so became the successor of Fitz-Ralph, the celebrated Bishop of Armagh, in that controversy. We know not Wood's evidence on this point, but we have little doubt that he had apparent warrant for what he has said. Mr. Shirley says that this is 'implicitly contradicted by contemporary authority.' If it be so, there is, of course, an end to that section of the Reformer's life, as commonly understood. The authority referred to is Wodeford, a great opponent of the Reformer. But the testimony of this writer is singularly conflicting. He gives us three incidents as marking the point of time from which Wycliffe began to publish his 'depraved opinions'—when he took the degree of Doctor, when he was expelled from Canterbury Hall, and when he became provoked against the mendicants for publicly condemning his 'heresies concerning the sacrament of the altar.' Mr. Shirley has attempted to show when Wycliffe



took his degree, and would have us believe that it was so early as in the year 1363. If so, then the writers who date the origin of the movements of Wycliffe as a Reformer to about the year 1360, have not been so far wrong. With regard to the Canterbury Hall date, Mr. Shirley does not believe that Wycliffe ever had anything to do with that hall, and cannot, therefore, attach much importance to the statement which attributes his course as a Reformer to the mortification produced by that expulsion. There only remains the statement that he had said nothing against the mendicants until they had publicly condemned his heresies on the Eucharist. When was that? The Reformer's doctrine on that subject was not pronounced to be heresy, and publicly condemned as such, before 1381; and are we to believe that all Wycliffe's zeal on the side of the University and of the secular clergy, against the religious orders and the papacy, was the growth of the last three or four years of his life? The idea is absurd. This view of the matter proves greatly too much; and, to use Mr. Shirley's language, 'it is implicitly contradicted by contemporary authority.' If history has given us one idea about Wycliffe more prominently than another, it is the idea which depicts him as the special antagonist of the mendicants. But Mr. Shirley will perhaps say that he has shown from Wodeford that Wycliffe had some peculiar ideas about the Eucharist which he held publicly in the schools while only a Bachelor, apparently before he had taken his Master's degree. Be it so; and if we suppose the mendicants to have been his opponents thus early, as we may be sure they were, then they may very naturally have felt the force of his indignation against them even thus early; and so the received opinion in regard to that stage of the Reformer's history may, after all, be the true one. Received opinions in relation to great facts, whether in the life of a man or of a nation, are rarely without some basis. The effect of attempting to do away with such impressions is often only to make it more certain that whether the direct evidence in relation to them be forthcoming or not, such evidence there has been. The new hypothesis in such cases, when fairly sifted, is often felt to be less tenable than the old.

Moreover, in regard to this controversy between Wycliffe and the mendicants, we are in danger of greatly underrating the liberty of speech and of writing on such topics which our strong-nerved ancestors of the time of Edward III. really enjoyed. The rhetoric with which Fitz-Ralph laid bare the artifices of the mendicants, and pointed to the mischiefs produced by them, was of the boldest description. He had himself been Chancellor of Oxford, and he denounced the friars as having by their fraudulent

practices reduced the number of students in that university, within his memory, from 30,000 to not more than a fifth of that number. Such a trade, too, did these false religionists carry on in pardonings, that multitudes of the most lawless characters in the Archbishop's diocese, whom his clergy would not have thought of absolving, were confessed and absolved without scruple by the mendicants. The man who spoke thus was never charged with heresy, nor troubled in any way by the authorities of the time on account of his opinions. Let any man look at the pictures which Chaucer has drawn of monks and friars, and other ecclesiastical persons, and he will see how far Wycliffe might have gone in that direction in 1360, or thereabouts, without being classed with heretics, and without hazard of inconvenience from men in office, either civil or ecclesiastical. But even his dispute with the mendicants would, no doubt, become another and a new affair in the eyes of Wodeford, when it became coupled with many opinions deemed nothing less than heretical. It is probable, too, that Wycliffe's antagonism to the religious orders was really deepened by the conspicuous part taken by them in condemning his doctrine on the Eucharist.

Wodeford, and Netter of Walden, the supposed collector of the papers in the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, and the author of the narrative which connects them, make the time when Wycliffe took his degree to be his starting-point as a Reformer. That time has been hitherto supposed to be 1372. The document in Rymer, which assigns Wycliffe his place in the embassy to Bruges, shows that he was certainly Doctor, and in consequence Professor, in 1374. Mr. Shirley would make it appear that Wycliffe had been Doctor and Professor nine years before that time, instead of two years only—that is, in 1363, instead of 1372. This is another new reading in the life of the Reformer. But this also will be found to consist of a superstructure without a foundation. In two of the papers by Cunningham against Wycliffe, printed in this volume, Wycliffe is described simply as Master; in the third, which seems to have followed soon after, he is described both as Master and Doctor. The question is—can the date of this paper, in which Cunningham begins to describe Wycliffe as Doctor, be ascertained? This question Mr. Shirley answers in the affirmative. This third paper, he writes—

‘Is an answer to one written by Wyclif, and now printed in our Appendix. This tract, therefore, of Wyclif was written before, and not long before, the date we are attempting to fix.

‘Now, in this tract the Reformer declares his intention of not entering for the present on a subject which afterwards gave a title to two of his best known works, the *Theory of Dominion*, or, as we should now

call it, of Church and State. But the fragment on that subject, printed by Lewis (p. 349), bears internal evidence that it was written probably in 1366, certainly not later than the following year, and the long work, *De Dominio Divino*, from which, possibly, Lewis's fragment is an extract, was published at the latest in 1368.

'The evidence, therefore, confines us absolutely to 1361 on the one side, and to 1366 on the other.'—Introduction, xvi. xvii.

Mr. Shirley, for reasons which he assigns, fixes on 1363 as the year in which he supposes Wycliffe to have become Doctor and Professor. But everything here depends on the question—does Wycliffe say in this now printed document that, up to that time, he had abstained from writing on the subject of Dominion—or what we now call the question of Church and State? Nothing of the sort. His language, in place of saying that he had not written on that subject, rather implies that he had, and merely intimates that he is not to be diverted into that topic at present, lest he should lose sight of the topic properly in hand. Here are his words:—

'Nemo enim donat secundum ampliorem titulum quam ipsemet habet, licet posset esse occasio. Unde Deus donat amplius dominium quam etiam habet iste dans. *Ista est pulchra via ad introducendum materiam de dominio, sed oportet ab illa supersedere ad tempus, ne materia accepta præ manibus omittatur.*'—p. 456.

According to Mr. Shirley's interpretation of this passage, when a man says, 'I shall not go into that subject at present, for it does not belong to my present argument,' you are always to infer that the man has never gone into that subject in his life! It really amounts to this. Nevertheless, Mr. Shirley's echo in the *Quarterly* accounts this 'a very ingenious argument,' and looks on the matter as settled! From the ground as thus settled, Mr. Shirley goes off into high philosophical speculation on the synchronism of this memorable year 1363—the juncture when the chivalry of England reached its climax, and Wycliffe entered on his course as a Reformer:

Wycliffe may have taken his degree of Doctor earlier than 1372, and Mr. Shirley may live to show that he did, but he has done nothing towards that object at present.

Next we have the question which is likely to become rather a vexed question—viz., whether the Warden of Canterbury Hall was Wycliffe the Reformer, or a Wycliffe—or 'Whyteclyve'—of Mayfield. This question was mooted for the first time in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1844. It has since been examined by several competent writers, and has left their former belief on this subject undisturbed. The learned editors of Wycliffe's

Bible, Dr. Madden and Dr. Forshall, had all the material points of the case before them, but they did not find either the Warden of Canterbury Hall, or the seneschal of Merton, in the John Whyteclyve of Mayfield. Mr. Pratt has since that bestowed great care on the question, and he finds the Reformer in the expelled warden, and in the Wycliffe of Queen's and of Merton. Citing a document describing the society of Balliol College while Wycliffe was Master, Mr. Pratt remarks :—

‘The distinction between *Magister* and *Dominus*, in the above extract, refers to the M.A. and B.A. degrees, and suggests a pretty decisive proof, hitherto unnoticed, that the Warden of Canterbury Hall was a different individual from the Vicar of Mayfield. For the Warden, in his appointment by Islep, in his removal by Langham, and in the Papal process, is always styled *Magister*, save that his opponents in the suit cunningly drop the prefix, knowing that Friar Wodebull's want of the M.A. degree disqualified him for the wardenship, according to the University statutes. Whereas Johannes de Whyteclyve, vicar of Mayfield, in all the four archiepiscopal registers in which he is mentioned, is invariably styled *Dominus* to his dying day, and even in the probate of his will, which proves that he never attained the M.A. degree, if ever he took any academic degree at all. He was an ordinary man, who owed his promotion to some accident.’ —Pratt's *Fore*, vol. iii., App. p. 512.

The man who had never taken his Master's degree could not have been fellow of Merton, and was less likely to have been chosen by Islep to be Master of Canterbury Hall.

But Mr. Shirley's great reason for concluding that Wycliffe was not the Warden of Canterbury Hall is, that Wodeford, the Reformer's great opponent, stands alone among his contemporaries in asserting it. But Wodeford stands alone in asserting that Wycliffe held peculiar views about the sacrament of the altar while only in his Bachelor's degree; and in asserting that the Reformer did not attack the mendicants until they had condemned his doctrine on that subject. On these two points Mr. Shirley accepts the unsupported testimony of Wodeford as sufficient—why not on the other point? It may be said, because there are probabilities against that point. But so there are against the other two. Wodeford's assertion as to the date of Wycliffe's controversy with the mendicants, according to Mr. Shirley's understanding of it, is utterly incredible; and if Wodeford was really so ill-informed, as to make Wycliffe the Warden of Canterbury Hall, when he was not, and when, as the Master of Balliol, he must have become a man of mark, was he likely to be well-informed about the shades of the Reformers thinking on the subject of the Eucharist when he was a young man in his

Bachelor's degree? But thus unsteady—thus apparently capricious, are Mr. Shirley's criticisms generally.

We must notice, however, that Mr. Shirley has printed a passage from one of the Vienna MSS. in which Wycliffe refers to this suit, and an interesting passage it is, on this account. But Mr. Shirley's use of it furnishes another instance of the facility with which he seems to discover in a document whatever it is agreeable to find there. We give the passage as it is:—

'Homo potest facere nedum bonum de genere, sed bene moraliter, et tamen cum hoc et in hoc peccare venialiter, ut ista pars habet dicere in familiari exemplo. Nam dominus Symon Ilysep, archiepiscopus Cantuarensis, fundavit unum collegium in Oxonia plus pia intentione, ut evidentius creditur, quam de fundatione cujuscunque abbatiæ in Anglia, et ordinavit quod in ea sub forma laudabili studeant ad utilitatem ecclesiæ puri clerici seculares; quod et factum est. Et tunc, ipso mortuo, simoniace commentis mendacii eversum est tam pii patroni propositum, et illis expulsis pauci alii, non egentes, sed divitiis affluentes, contra decretum captum ex dictis B. Hieronymi xii. qu. 2. 'Gloria episcopi est pauperum opibus providere; ignominia sacerdotis est propriis studere divitiis.' Et cum pretextum (pretextu?) illius facti sophistici 'Episcopus et suum capitulum sunt una persona, a qua non licet alienare bona illius ecclesiæ,' ista persona vindicat bona illius collegii proprietarie possidere. Unde consulendum videtur domino Wintoniensi (William of Wykeham) ut caveat hanc cautelam. Credo autem quod dictus Symon peccavit fundando dictum collegium, sed non tantum quantum anti-Symon, qui ipsum dissolverat.'—p. 526.

The following is as literal a rendering of this passage as we can give:—

'No man can do anything essentially (or absolutely) good. But he may do right morally (or in moral intention), and yet, with this and in it, he may commit some venial sin—as one may illustrate by a familiar example. For master Symon Islep, Archbishop of Canterbury, founded a college in Oxford, with a more pious purpose, as is believed on ample evidence, than (was shown) in the foundation of any abbey in England; and he appointed, according to a very creditable scheme, that in it there should study for the service of the church purely secular clerks—which was carried out. And then, after his death, simoniacally, and on false pretences, the plan of this very good patron was overthrown, and they (the seculars) having been expelled, a few others, by no means needy, but abounding in wealth (were brought in), contrary to the decree taken from the sayings of St. Jerome (ii. qu. 2). 'It is the glory of a bishop to provide for the needy—it is the disgrace of a priest to delight in his own wealth;' and on the sophistical ground that a bishop and his income are one person, from which it becomes unlawful to alienate church property—

that person claims the property of that college as his own; from which proceeding my Lord of Winchester deems it wise to protect himself against exception in this form. I hold, then, that the said Simon sinned in founding the said college, but not so greatly as did anti-Simon in dissolving it.'

On this extract Mr. Shirley thus writes :—

'In this last sentence Archbishop Islep is spoken of as having infringed that principle of the unlawfulness of perpetual eleemosynary endowments which formed a part of Wycliffe's theory of dominion. That theory was promulgated by the Reformer in Oxford only a few months after the disputed nomination to the wardenship, and it was hinted at probably two or three years before, in his public discussion with Cunningham. Who can suppose that the promulgator was himself the warden?'—pp. 526-7.

The 'theory of dominion,' here said to have been published by Wycliffe in 1366, is contained in his defence of the crown in refusing payment of the King John tribute money. . From the language of Mr. Shirley, who would not conclude that in this argument the Reformer must have clearly and unequivocally committed himself against all perpetual endowments for the purposes of charity or learning—to say nothing of religion. But in truth the Reformer has done nothing of the kind. For anything contained in that paper Wycliffe was no more bound to such a principle from that time than Mr. Shirley himself is bound to it now. The argument of that paper is, that in temporal matters the crown should always take precedence of the mitre; that King John, in his transaction with Pope Innocent inverted this order of authority; and that the King of England, accordingly, was perfectly justified in repudiating that proceeding altogether. One of the lords, in the course of his argument, is described as hinting to his Holiness that even a pope is liable to sin, and that, according to divines, a pope in mortal sin cannot hold dominion at all. It is enough, therefore, says this lord, that the kingdom should be subject to one lord, and that we all keep ourselves from mortal sin, and communicate of our goods charitably to the poor. These are the sentences which Mr. Shirley interprets as opposed to all 'perpetual eleemosynary endowments.' That a priest in mortal sin should repent of his sin, or cease from his vocation, is, we presume, a doctrine we all hold. There is room to doubt whether Wycliffe *ever* avowed the extreme principle which Mr. Shirley seems, for polemical purposes, to attribute to him. It certainly is not in the paper appealed to as containing it, nor is it in the above extract now produced for the first time by Mr. Shirley.

It is to be regretted that we do not see more of the connexion of this extract. In the sentence with which it commences, the Reformer says that man can do nothing absolutely good—that something of the imperfect will mix with it, and the case of Canterbury Hall is given as an illustration. The tone throughout is commendatory of what Islep had done in founding that hall. It became him, as a pious churchman, so to care for the poor scholars. But he committed an error, by which men of less principle succeeded in frustrating his intentions, and William of Wykeham, in doing a work of the same kind, had taken care to guard against the same mistake. When Wycliffe says, therefore, in conclusion, that Islep sinned in founding the hall, he can hardly mean that he sinned in founding it at all, but that—in conformity with the principle under discussion—he vitiated an act good in itself by something unwise in the mode of performing it. What was this something unwise? Let it be remembered that Islep's foundation was originally for the benefit of a society to consist, in part, of men belonging to the religious orders, not of secular clerks alone; and if this fact be borne in mind, the following passage from Lowth's *Life of Wykeham* seems to show where the 'venial' sin lay in Islep's otherwise very worthy service.

'He (Wykeham) had long resolved to dispose of the wealth, which the Divine Providence had so abundantly bestowed upon him, to some charitable use, and for the public good; but was greatly embarrassed when he came to fix his choice on some design that was likely to prove most beneficial, and least liable to abuse. He tells us himself (Statut. Coll. Oxon. and Wint.) that upon this occasion he diligently examined and considered the various rules of the religious orders, and compared with them the lives of their professors; but was obliged with grief to declare, that he could not anywhere find that the ordinances of their founders, according to their true design and intention, were at present observed by any of them. This reflection affected him greatly, and inclined him to take the resolution of distributing his riches to the poor with his own hands, rather than employ them in establishing an institution, which might become a snare and an occasion of guilt to those for whose benefit it should be designed. After much deliberation and devout invocation of the Divine assistance, considering how greatly the number of the clergy had been of late reduced by continual wars and frequent pestilences, he determined at last to endeavour to remedy, so far as he was able, this desolation of the church, by relieving poor scholars in their clerical education, and to establish two colleges of students, for the honour of God and the increase of his worship, for the support and exaltation of the Christian faith, and for the improvement of the liberal arts and sciences.'—pp. 92—95.

It thus seems clear, that the point in which Wykeham profited

by the experience of Canterbury Hall, was in resolving to have nothing to do with the religious orders. For it was the error in respect of Islep's first scheme, which embraced the religious orders, along with seculars, that brought on his infant foundation all its troubles, and ended in an expulsion of the seculars to make room for the monks—the proceeding denounced by Wycliffe as a robbing of the poor to confer needless wealth upon the rich. The assumption that Islep was not at liberty so to appropriate his income, is not accepted by Wycliffe. Is repudiated as a sophism.

It should be observed, that from the reference in this extract to the Bishop of Winchester, who did not found New College before 1379, it is evident that when the passage was written some ten years must have passed since the Canterbury Hall case had been judged and settled. Wycliffe's intimate acquaintance with the history of the case after that lapse of time, and the terms in which he condemns the papal verdict upon it, are just such as might have been expected on the supposition of his having been himself the warden. We scarcely need say, that could Wycliffe be shown to have held the doctrine which Mr. Shirley attributes to him in 1380, that would be no evidence of his having so thought in 1365, when he accepted his appointment as warden.

So another of Mr. Shirley's criticisms, commended with such edifying docility by his reviewer, falls to the ground.

Mr. Shirley says the object of the prelates in citing Wycliffe before them in 1377 was purely political, and meant as a blow, through the Reformer, at John of Gaunt.

'Whatever opinions Wyclif may really have held, a question we reserve for the present, it is certain that the principles which he had avowed, and on which he had defended the ecclesiastical policy of his patron, may have easily appeared to many to be subversive of the framework of society. Convocation arraigned these political doctrines as heresies, and appointed William of Wykeham one of the judges. How utterly the meaning of this prosecution was political may be gathered from the total omission in the articles of accusation of all matters not bearing on the question of the hour. Wyclif had been long ago accused of heresy on the subject of the Incarnation, but this was not mentioned; his doctrine of the imperishability of matter had been actually condemned by Archbishop Langham, it was not alluded to; he had been accused of reviving the necessitarian tenets of Bradwardine, but neither were these touched upon. The object of the prosecution was to proclaim to the world that society was endangered by the political principles which John of Gaunt was putting in practice against the church.'—xxvi., xxvii.

No doubt, the clergy meant that—meant to alarm the timid,



and to injure John of Gaunt, their great opponent at that moment, by proclaiming Wycliffe's political doctrines as dangerous to society. But it is strange that Mr. Shirley should have described the articles of accusation against the Reformer as drawn up on the plan of excluding everything not belonging to the politics of the hour, while in fact one half of those articles have nothing to do with politics, and relate exclusively to spirituals—that is, to the spiritual pretensions of the Roman priesthood. Here are some of them :—

‘ We know that it is not possible that the Vicar of Christ merely by his Bulls, or by them together with his own will and consent, and that of the College of Cardinals, should qualify or disable any man.

‘ It is not possible that a man should be excommunicated to his damage, unless he be excommunicated first and principally by himself.

‘ No one ought, except in the cause of God, to excommunicate, suspend, or interdict any one, or to proceed according to any ecclesiastical censure by way of revenge.

‘ Cursing or excommunication does not bind finally, only so far as it is used against an adversary of the law of Christ.

‘ The disciples of Christ have no power to exact temporalities by censures or civil compulsion.

‘ We ought to believe that then only does a Christian priest bind or loose, when he simply obeys the law of God.’

The reader will judge whether the questions thus raised belong exclusively to the domain of politics. They are, in fact, questions that go to the root of the Roman church as a spiritual system, and aim at nothing less than taking the souls of men out of her hands. It would be in vain to say that these heresies, as they were called, were rather ecclesiastical than theological. Such was their vast spiritual import, and we doubt much if there was anything that *could* be adduced against Wycliffe as theological heresy, in the more direct sense, with any colourable pretext, at that time. It would be easy to show that an attempt to get up a case of heresy against him on any one of the three grounds mentioned by Mr. Shirley would have been absurd. We know not when Cunningham charged the Reformer with heresy on the Incarnation, nor is it material to know. *None* of the public proceedings against him make mention of heresy on that subject. Wycliffe's enemies must have known, moreover, that to attempt to make him a heretic on the ground of his speculations about the imperishability of matter, could only serve to show how much they had been straitened for material against him; and to have proceeded against a man for believing on the subject of the freedom of the will with Bradwardine and St. Augustine, would, if possible, have been still more impolitic. If the Convocation of 1377 *could* have

charged Wycliffe with theological heresy, we may be assured they would have placed that charge in the foreground then, as they did in 1381. The moment a tangible ground for accusation in that shape became available, it was seized, and one of the immediate effects was the memorable disownment of Wycliffe by John of Gaunt. Concerning the obscure dogmas ascribed to Wycliffe in those articles touching the basis of human authority and human possessions, it is sufficient to observe that Wycliffe's writings are full of passages showing the ideal and harmless sense in which he interpreted those tenets. In his view the Divine Being was chief lord in relation to all earthly authorities and possessions. All were received from him on conditions, and those conditions failing, the gifts were really forfeited—but forfeited in respect to God, not in respect to man. There was a difference, indeed, between secular lords and spiritual. The former might deprive the latter of their possessions if habitually delinquent. But Wycliffe had no such summary mode of dealing with the question as it affected the lords temporal. When temporal lords became thus delinquent, what their position might be in relation to God was one thing, what it was in relation to man was another. We may be assured that the most material points of alleged heresy or error that could be collected from the Reformer's earlier Latin writings up to 1377, were then adduced against him. THOSE POINTS GIVE US A LANDMARK IN HIS HISTORY.

As another instance of the manner in which Mr. Shirley can assume the merit of discovery where he has made none, we may notice his reference to the relation between Wycliffe and his 'poor priests.' It is mentioned as a circumstance 'little known,' that those itinerant preachers bore some resemblance to the early Methodist preachers under the direction of John Wesley; and it is suggested that if Wycliffe could only have kept free from heresy, he might have wrought them up into a new order, and so might have been considered as their founder. All we know of Wycliffe's relation to these preachers is, that he applauded their labours, and that he denounced the conduct of their persecutors; and if these facts be 'little known,' and if the character of the preachers themselves be 'little known,' the blame does not rest, we think, with those who have preceded Mr. Shirley in writing about Wycliffe. One of these writers, describing the preamble of a statute, prepared by the bishops in 1382 against this new order of public instructors, says:—

'There is even in this dry law-paper something of the pictorial. These 'poor priests'—these sturdy, free-spoken and popular *Methodists* of the fourteenth century, are here travelling before us, from county

to county, from town to town, and village to village, barefooted, staff in hand, the visible personation of the toilsome, the generous, the noblehearted. In churches or churchyards, in markets or fairs, before gentle or simple, pious or profligate,—wherever men or women are gathered together, or may be gathered, there the itinerant instructor of this school finds his preaching-place, and discourses boldly on the difference between the religion of the Bible, with its appeals to every man's reason and conscience, and the superstitions of the priests, which have nothing to sustain them save that hollow mockery called the authority of the Church. Prelates and abbots, mendicants and monks, rectors and curates, become wrathful—but the people are not wrathful. Almost to a man they attest that the stranger is in the right, and that harm shall not be done to him. Knighton mentions a number of persons of some figure who openly favoured the new preachers—such as Sir Thomas Latimer, Sir John Trussell, Sir Lodovick Clifford, Sir John Peeche, Sir Richard Story, and Sir John Hilton. It was the manner of these distinguished persons, as our historian informs us, 'when a preacher of the Wycliffe order came into their neighbourhood, to give notice to all around of time and place, and to draw a vast audience together. Even beyond this did they proceed, for you might see them standing round the pulpit of the preacher, armed, and prepared to defend him from assault with their good swords, if there should be need. Knighton, who complains of this mode of proceeding as being rather Mohammedan than Christian in its spirit, is nevertheless obliged to give these Lollard or Puritan knights the credit of being governed by a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge.'—*De Eventibus*, 2660, 2661.

'The local official, not daring to go farther, serves his writ upon the disorderly stranger, requiring him to appear before his ordinary; but the stranger is speedily elsewhere, and at his wonted labour. Proud churchmen thunder their anathema against him—to him it is an empty sound. The soul under that coarse garb, and which plays from beneath that weatherworn countenance, is an emancipated soul—not so much the image of the age in which we find it, as the *prophecy of an age to come*—to come only after a long, a dark, and a troubled interval shall have passed away.'—*John de Wycliffe; a Monograph*, —pp. 276—279.

Mr. Shirley is no stranger to the volume from which this extract is taken. Nevertheless, in the face of what is there written, he can intimate to his readers that the labours of these preachers, and Wycliffe's patronage of them, are facts which have been so neglected by the Reformer's worthless biographers as to be 'little known,' leaving it to his own better information and intelligence to bring the subject into daylight, and to present it in its true significance. Mr. Shirley's reviewer is especially struck with finding for the first time that modern Methodism has its type so far back in our history as the fourteenth century!

Mr. Shirley thinks—and we suppose we must not say, thanks to his German critics for it, though they have certainly been before-hand with him on this point—that a close study of Wycliffe's 'Realism' as a thinker is an 'essential element' towards a just estimate of his character:—

'Whatever be the cause, almost all the religious life, and even all that was continuous even in the intellectual life of the middle ages, belonged to one or other of the various shades of realism. In the latter half of the fourteenth century, whatever there was among the clergy, either of such religious feeling or of intellectual activity, was to be found, speaking broadly, in the secular priests. As a body, therefore, they were naturally realists.'—liii.

These sentences invert the relations of cause and effect. In the first, men become intellectual and spiritual, because they are realists; and then they become realists because they are intellectual and spiritual. We do not say that Mr. Shirley is not an intelligent man, but this is only an instance of the sad want of certainty in the working of his intelligence. Admitting, however, as we certainly do, that there is a natural tendency towards liberalism in realism, yet seeing that half the thinkers of Europe were realists in the fourteenth century, and only one of them became a Wycliffe, is it not clear that the 'essential element'—the distinctive force, of this man's character, must be sought in some source above realism, and more potent than it? Great effects never come from small causes, and complex effects never come from simple causes. These maxims are so obvious as to be almost truisms. But what labour might have been spared had they been always remembered! It seems to be a besetting infirmity in much of the thinking of our time, to look in this manner to some one cause for greatly more than can possibly have proceeded from it. It is so pleasant, so sagacious, so scientific, to be able to lay hold on a single clue which shall unravel everything. But it is not sound philosophy, not common sense, that puts men on such a track. Realism had something to do with giving Wycliffe to history; but a higher power had much more to do with that event—the power, we mean, which lodges religious conviction in the souls of men according to a law of sovereignty little understood by us. Realism might have taught the Reformer his respect for human intelligence, but it was an influence above that which taught him his reverence for the word of God. His stern rationality helped to make him what he was, but much more came from that biblical influence which served to consecrate his rationality to its true uses. The root of Wycliffe's greatness lay in his fear of God, and in his sense of responsibility. He toiled

much, and braved much, but with the nature which God had given him he could not do otherwise. The spirit of self-consecration shut out the selfish. Something of this spirit in ourselves is of the *first* importance to a right understanding of the character of Wycliffe.\*

We repeat, Mr. Shirley is entitled to our gratitude for the care with which he has edited the papers in this volume. There is also some matter even in this sketch of the Reformer's life to which those who wish to study his times will do well to give attention. No modern writer has been infallible in writing about Wycliffe. So lost, through neglect and distance, is the material relating to him, that the question of mistake on the part of his biographers can only be a question of degree. Every man who has touched

\* The reviewer in the *Quarterly* regrets, in common with us all, that nothing is known concerning the history of the portrait of the Reformer at Wycliffe. The painting is on panel, in size about 18 inches by 14. It has a dark Rembrandt appearance, the head being the only object looking forth from a deep vandyke brown circumference, the dark ground having apparently become darker by age. It is described as an 'Original Picture,' by Sir Antonio More. As a work of art it is worthy of the pencil of that artist, but it has not the clearness and freshness so observable in the portraits by Sir Antonio in the recent Manchester Exhibition. It seems much older.

There is another portrait of the Reformer which has attracted some attention of late. It is in the possession of Henry Payne, Esq., of Leicester. This picture was presented for inspection at a meeting of the Archaeological Society in London, in November, 1851. In the next December the following account of it appeared in the *Gentleman's Magazine* :—

'A remarkable 'palimpsest' painting was shown by Mr. Payne, of Leicester, having been originally a portrait of Wycliffe, but painted over, and converted into that of 'Robertus Langton, Doctor,' whose name appears *concealing* that of Wycliffe.

'This latter work appears to be of the times shortly before the Reformation, and is very remarkable for the assemblage of pilgrim's signs which it displays. The original painting appears to be of the fifteenth century, and bears much resemblance to the fine portrait at Knole.'

These 'pilgrim's signs' which now disfigure the painting, and the name 'Robertus Langton,' owe their origin, we doubt not, to the same cause, and helped to disguise the portrait at some time when it was felt that it might be dangerous to be known to possess it. The name 'Robertus Langton' has been in gilt German-text letters : the name 'Johannes Wickliffe' is in a dark character, and seems to be of a much older date. Mr. Payne is disposed to think that Wycliffe may have sat for this portrait when at Bruges in 1374. But this can be only conjecture. If it be true, as stated by the reviewer in the *Quarterly*, that Italy itself has no portrait, even on panel, so old as the fourteenth century, then Mr. Payne's, which is on canvas, should be thus old is out of the question. It is an admirable painting. The artist achieves much with little appearance of elaboration. There is more in it to remind us of Sir Antonio More than in the painting at Wycliffe. Both heads are clearly representations of the same man. But Mr. Payne's portrait is not that of so old a man. The lips are more conspicuous, and the features are altogether somewhat bolder and firmer. It is remarkable that the portrait at Wycliffe is the only ancient painting in which the Reformer is represented without his staff. In all other respects, all the portraits we have seen have so much in common, as to bespeak a common origin. The staff, the book, and the same cap and gown, come up in them all, with the same cast of features. Wood, in his *Athenæ Oxonienses*, speaks of a Robertus Langton, who was a doctor, and died in 1524. But this affords no clue.

this subject has been in some things defective, in other things mistaken, and so it will be in the future. There is enough to do in this field to require the help of many hands. Gladly should we have hailed Mr. Shirley as a labourer had he brought another spirit to his work. But his attempt to be original, and to eclipse every one that has gone before him in this path, has betrayed him into theorizing, and taught him to see evidence where no mortal, we should think—always excepting his friend in the *Quarterly*—would ever have thought of seeing it. From his learning we might have expected something considerable; but so very peculiar is his manner of interpreting historical documents, that we feel that no statement made by him can be entitled to the least confidence, unless you have the means of examining for yourself the ground on which it is said to rest. Wycliffe's early Latin works are mostly philosophical and scholastic, of which some judgment may be formed from the first and second books of his *Dialogus*. The labour of reading and collating such works would be immense, and the return would probably be very inadequate; but we think Mr. Shirley might do some service in this way, and if shut up, as in the documentary part of this volume, to questions of philology, we should be glad to see him committed to the task—but only on that condition. His reputation has not been served, and will not be served, by writing on this subject as in the memoir before us. He has had many predecessors in this field—he depreciates them all, and, at the same time, has so managed as to be himself more at fault than the most faulty among them. We have not said all we might in exposure of these faults, but we have said a great deal more than it has been pleasant to say, and there is little probability of our returning to the subject. The other volumes in this important series of publications appear to be edited as such works should be edited. We deeply regret that the same cannot be said of the volume that has been entrusted to Mr. Shirley.

We gladly pass now to see what the scholars of the Continent have been doing on this subject. It is to be regretted that the great Neander has not shown a more adequate appreciation of Wycliffe's character and influence. But both Luther and Melancthon had learned to speak slightly of Wycliffe. Melancthon did not reckon him clear on Justification, and speaks of him as raving on matters of civil government; and Luther could pass him by as the 'hair-splitting' Wycliffe (*der spitzig*).<sup>\*</sup> The effect of this has been to turn the thoughts

<sup>\*</sup> Yet Neander calls attention to a remarkable passage in the *Dialogus*, in which Wycliffe seems to foretell the mission of Luther. 'I suppose,' says Wycliffe, 'that some brethren, whom God may vouchsafe to teach, will be devoutly con-

of the Germans away from our first Reformer for centuries, much as our own thoughts had been turned from him by other circumstances. Even so recently as when the erudite and diligent Winer published the last edition of his elaborate *Hand-book of Theological Literature*, with its supplement extending to the close of 1841, the subject of Wycliffe still remained almost a blank in German bibliography, as his meagre account shows. But more attention has been paid to matters relating to Wycliffe, and more veneration has been shown to his memory during the last dozen years in Germany than during the previous three centuries. 'It is quite gratuitous,' says Jaeger, 'for certain church historians, in their judgment concerning Wycliffe, to appeal to Luther's view, for that rests, no less than their own, on a superficial knowledge of the man. Is what Luther said at his table three hundred years ago to be the rule of our opinion for ever?' No—the present generation of German thinkers have put an end to that.

In general, indeed, what this more enlightened class have done has been rather dogmatic and theological than biographical. Concerning the *life* of the Reformer they furnish nothing that is not to be found in the English works which they cite as their authorities. But on the *opinions* of Wycliffe they have done more than we have done. They have given these with a minuteness, fulness, and system, quite in the German manner. The sources of their information are, the biographies of Wycliffe best known among ourselves, which come up in nearly every page they write, and the printed works of writers opposed to the Reformer, such as Walsingham, Knighton, Wodeford, and Walden,—and, above all, the TRIALOGUS.

Most of our readers will be aware that this last mentioned work is a Latin treatise, extending to more than three hundred quarto pages, in moderate type. It was compiled by the Reformer within two years of his death. In the first and second books it presents Wycliffe as the metaphysician and the schoolman; in the third and fourth books, as the theologian and the reformer. Two editions of this memorable treatise have been printed on the Continent, one in 1525, and another in 1754. In this country it has

verted to the primitive religion of Christ, and abandoning their false interpretations of genuine Christianity, after having demanded or acquired for themselves permission from antichrist, will freely return to the religion of Christ as it was at first, and then they will build up the Church like Paul.' p. 271). Thus he expresses the expectation that a return to the true way of following Christ would proceed from the bosom of monachism itself; that its friends would obtain liberty from the pope to live in their own way, or would find means of conquering that liberty, and this would be the commencement of a renovated church.'—*Hist. Reformation Movements in England*.

never been printed, but nearly the whole of it has been made accessible to the English reader in a literal translation.\*

It is refreshing to note the catholic spirit in which the mental processes, and the active life of Wycliffe, are estimated by most of his continental critics, and the thankfulness with which they avail themselves of help towards the study of his career as a Reformer, come from what quarter it may. They have left it to the countrymen of our Reformer to disgrace both him and themselves by looking at him in relation to the narrow limits of some particular church or sect. It is enough for the representatives of thought in Germany to see in Wycliffe the great patriarch of our common Protestantism. That his system is not in all points their own they know. But their marvel is, that a man so intently occupied to his last hour in demolishing the enormous impositions of his age, should have found it possible to make any approach towards a system of any kind. They know, therefore, how to judge him charitably, and how to be grateful to any man who has done something to uphold and vindicate his memory.

The first in the order of time in this series of authors is Dr. Groneman, whose work appears third in the list at the head of this article. That volume was published in 1837. We shall be excused, we trust, for allowing the author to mention his authorities.

‘As to my authorities, I have availed myself as well of the works of those who were the enemies of Wycliffe, as of those authors who held him in the highest estimation. Accordingly, I have made especial use of the histories of Henry Knighton and Thomas Walsingham, the former of whom flourished in the time of Wycliffe, the latter in the following century. I have consulted beyond these many records of councils, the public enactments, and the works of Bale, Fox, Harpsfield, Wood, Wharton, and others who have written about Wycliffe. Though I saw that his character and doctrine were to be best elucidated from his own writings, I had no opportunity of examining his MSS., which are preserved in great numbers to this day, when those English writers who have immortalized their countryman assisted me, and held out an admirable light for my guidance. For what had been commenced by Thomas James, in his *Apology for John Wickliffe*, published in the year 1608, and by John Lewis, in his book entitled *The History of the Life and Sufferings of John Wiclif, D.D.*, London, 1720, has been carried out with much more accuracy, fulness, and labour, in our own time by Mr. Robert Vaughan, in his work intitled *The Life and Opinions of John de Wycliffe*, London, second edition, 1831, who has illustrated the life, character, and doctrines of

\* *Tracts and Treatises of John de Wycliffe, D.D., with Selections and Translations from his Latin Works.* By the Rev. Robert Vaughan, D.D. 8vo. Wycliffe Society, 1845.



the Reformer with extraordinary success, from the Wycliffe MSS.'—Preface.

Dr. Groneman's volume presents a judicious summary of what may be learnt from the above sources in regard to the life and doctrine of our Reformer—presents it to the scholars of Europe in the language common to them. More than one work appeared subsequently in Germany on this subject, founded avowedly on Dr. Vaughan's publication; but the next production of importance consisted of a series of articles on the doctrine of Wycliffe, in the *Zeitschrift für die Historische Theologie*, in 1846 and 1847, from the pen of Dr. Lewald, Professor of Theology at Heidelberg. The aim of Professor Lewald is to present Wycliffe, not in the more popular aspects of his history, so much as in the light of the academical divine. It is Wycliffe's doctrine as a whole, and in the most systematic shape in which it can be presented, with which he is concerned—but indeed we cannot do better than allow him to describe his task in his own words:—

'In various biographies of Wycliffe, as well as in the more copious amongst the works on church history, are to be found sketches of his doctrinal system with illustrative passages appended. In these summaries the doctrines and principles more immediately connected with his Reforming bias, the points of difference between him and the dominant church of his age, are mainly regarded. The well-planned biography by Vaughan, rich in extracts and verbatim citations from Wycliffe's still unprinted writings, gives us more than this. The attempt to furnish, as I propose to do here, such an exhibition of Wycliffe's doctrinal belief (*glaubenslehre*) as shall be somewhat more thoroughly elaborated in point of systematic arrangement than former productions of the kind, one entering more into the peculiarities of the scholastic processes of thought, and developing with greater precision certain philosophico-dogmatical fundamental ideas of the Reformer, will not, I hope, be unwelcome to the reader.

'The *Libri IV. Dialogorum*, or, as it is otherwise intitled, the *Dialogus*, composed by Wycliffe at an advanced age, will form the main source of information in reference to this object of historical research—a work whose remarkable contents in many points of view would prove a still more powerful attraction to the earnest student, if it did not so easily frighten readers away from it by its ugly look in point of style and composition. It is its defectiveness in this respect, and especially its unmethodical, desultory treatment of the subjects handled in the disputations—which are not always brought to any definite conclusion—which explains why, even for a purpose such as mine, it has not as yet been rendered so available in all its parts as it ought. Since we are anxious to supply what is wanting in this respect, so far as what is of most weight is concerned, we shall do our best so to follow the train of thought in the particular dialogues,

that the main threads of the discussion may always be in our grasp. Many too refined scholastic distinctions and subtle scruples, which the author mentions only to throw aside, we take no notice of.

'Besides the *Triologus* we have as additional sources the *Inedita*, or fragments of such, to be found in Lewis and Vaughan, and particular pieces of Wycliffe, which have already appeared in print, as, for example, the *Ostiolum* or 'Wicket' relating to the Lord's Supper (Norimberg, 1516, 8vo). For our knowledge of the dialectical basis of his realism, the publication of his work, *De Universalibus*, as yet extant in manuscript only, would be of importance.'—*Zeitschrift f. d. Hist. Theol.*, 1846, H. 2, S. 171—173.

As an honest and skillful guide through the thorny mazes of the *Triologus*, Dr. Lewald has fairly earned by these patient and self-denying labours the highest praise. He has been the first to do what some Englishman should long since have done. The amount of loving toil involved in what has been thus accomplished must have been very great. Professor Lewald has re-suscitated the Reforming Schoolman—has loosed Wycliffe from the scholastic cements of the fourteenth century, and enabled him to speak to us in the scientific language of our own time. But the Reformer is still the Professor discoursing to his academic auditory. Indeed, the main fault we have to find with Dr. Lewald is, that he has made Wycliffe too much like a modern Heidelberg professor. The metaphysical Wycliffe of the early part of the *Triologus* is starched and cold, and gives us scarcely the germ of Wycliffe the Reformer. We should rather have had Wycliffe in something of undress. We have to thank Dr. Lewald for disentangling the ideas of the Reformer from the meshes of scholasticism, and for reducing them to order, but this need not have been done after the manner of a Dutch garden, or of a railway-ticket office. We have here nothing but cold bony analysis. There is not even an attempt at synthesis, but the *catalogue raisonnée* of Wycliffe's opinions unwinds its slow length along with an unbroken uniformity to the end. Of course we cannot quote with any advantage from such a composition. It must suffice to indicate briefly the arrangement Dr. Lewald has adopted in reducing the opinions of the Reformer to a system. The principal parts, or vertebræ—for we cannot help being reminded of the fossil remains of some old saurian—are seven in number. First we have Wycliffe's sentiments on the Sources whence our knowledge of the Christian religion is to be drawn, and on Faith as a particular mode of conviction. The subdivisions are:—1. Scripture, the rule of right belief. 2. How Scripture is to be expounded. 3. The right of all Christians to read the Scriptures. 4. The relations between Faith and Knowledge—

Of Faith in its practical aspect—Light of Faith and Light of Reason. The Second Part relates to Wycliffe's doctrine of God, his existence, essence, and attributes. Part the Third gives us his doctrine on the Trinity. Part the Fourth develops his peculiar doctrine of Ideas, and of the Necessity of all that actually exists, together with the Negativity of everything not grounded in God. The Fifth Part details his views of Creation and the Creatures, of Man as consisting of body and soul, his Angelology and Demonology. Then follows his doctrine concerning the Fall and Redemption; the Incarnation and the Atonement. Lastly, we have his teaching as to the Sacraments, with an appendix relative to his views on the nature and functions of the Church. The passages brought together from Wycliffe's writings as bearing on these various topics are of great value as thus arranged, and will be of vast service in the hands of those who may know how to make a more popular use of them than Professor Lewald has attempted.

Professor Leo, of Halle, thinks Wycliffe should be regarded rather as a heretic than as a reformer: an insinuation which, coming as it does from so reckless a partisan of the High Lutheran reactionaries, will hardly create surprise. It is more sad to find a man like Guericke (*Kirchengeschichte*, Bd. i. s. 779, Erst. Ausg.) denying his possession of the Holy Ghost. On this Jaeger quietly remarks: 'This usurped *χαρισμα διακρίσεως* stood greatly in need of a tonic regimen, such as might have been found in a study of the works of Lewis and Vaughan,' and accordingly undertakes to prove in opposition to such ignorant and uncharitable judgments that, 'in Wycliffe all the maxims and principles of the Reformation found for the first time a definite and all-sided expression, and that to him belongs, amongst all the forerunners of the Reformation, the title of the Forerunner in an eminent sense.' The occasion both of the composition and of the publication of Jaeger's production affords illustration of the growing interest taken in the subject throughout Germany. For it was written with a view to a competition proposed in 1851 by the Protestant Theological Faculty of the University of Tübingen, on 'the theological characteristics of John Wycliffe, his opposition to the dogmas of the Catholic Church, and his importance as a Reformer compared with John Huss and John Wessel on the one hand, and with Luther on the other.' Having been awarded the prize, it was laid by for a while until the Ultramontane attempts of the Archbishop of Friburg against the Baden Government seemed to the author to present a fitting opportunity for calling the attention of his countrymen to the great man who first struck the key-note of patriotic resistance to

Rome in England. His Essay is a most genial one, and furnishes a very delightful and instructive comparative study of the four sturdy pillars which in England, Holland, Bohemia, and Germany upheld the rising temple of a renovated Christianity. Our author's method in the treatment of his subject is sketched by his own hand in the following extract, which must serve instead of a more detailed analysis:—

‘We first delineate Wycliffe apart. The starting-point and centre of gravity, so to speak, of his work falls on the side of *faith and doctrine*. If we treat this question first of all according to its subjective aspect, this will give us the *theological characteristics* of Wycliffe in the narrower sense, and this portion of our work will have to do with the fundamental Christian dogmas, with Wycliffe's Christian view of things purely as such. When we have thus become acquainted with the deep substructure of his power, our Second Part will show how these theological convictions took up arms against the externalism of the ecclesiastical dogma, and will treat of *his opposition to the Catholic creed*. After summing up the general results of the inquiries entered on in the First Part, it will exhibit Wycliffe's antagonistic views under the two heads of the doctrine of the Sacraments and that of the Church. The latter will of itself lead us by a natural transition to the Third Part—viz., the delineation of Wycliffe's character as a Reformer, and of the *means* at his command and the *plans* which he formed for the renovation of the Church; in which place we shall have to speak of his relations to the ecclesiastical authorities, to the people, and to the State. This done, we shall gather up the results, and on the basis thus secured shall proceed to the examination of what forms the second main division of our subject—viz., Wycliffe's importance with reference to the Reformation, side by side with the men who paved the way for it on the one hand, and with the man who at length accomplished it on the other.’—*Jaeger*, pp. 18, 19.

In the comparison between Wycliffe and Huss, our author is more just to our illustrious countryman than Neander, who, he rightly complains, shows too much disposition to underrate the English Reformer's share in the Bohemian movement. The space assigned to Wycliffe in Neander's posthumous volume affords a fresh illustration of the growing German interest in the Lutterworth evangelist, and is welcome to our national feeling. But we fear it cannot be said that the prince of church historians has in this portion of his immortal work risen to the height of his great argument. Such is also Jaeger's deliverance upon the point. He says:—

‘As regards the delineation of Wycliffe in the sixth and most recent volume of Neander's *Church History*, we find it sadly wanting in arrangement, completeness, and profound apprehension of the man, and in the course of our task we shall be compelled here and there to

impugn one and another of his perverse judgments. At the very outset we must lift up our voice against his placing the entire history of Wycliffe under the rubric, 'History of Theology and Doctrine.' 'In the ideas scattered by Matthias of Janow,' says Neander, 'we have all that was wanted to produce the Bohemian revolt, and that out of these ideas, without the superadded influence of Wycliffe, a struggle, pushed continually farther and farther through the opposition of the great anti-reforming party, might have developed itself.'

On which Jaeger pertinently remarks, that it is idle to ask what *might* have happened apart from Wycliffe's influence. That influence was there, and had wrought far more powerfully than that of Matthias of Janow on Huss himself at any rate, and still more on Jerome of Prague, who is doubtless of more importance than Huss so far as regards the beginning of the Bohemian commotions. He then proceeds:—

- 'The true state of the case was in general as follows:—Already, before the time of Huss, the practical opposition to the prevailing abuses, just as it showed itself sporadically everywhere, so also was it carried on with particular vigour here in Bohemia by Janow and his compeers, and this path was followed up by Huss with equal zeal. Wycliffe's writings were already known there, at least in part, but without as yet having attracted special attention. But in the year 1398, Jerome of Prague brought home with him from Oxford other writings of Wycliffe, dispersed them with the greatest enthusiasm, and became inspired with zeal on behalf of the English doctrines. It was this newly-kindled interest in the doctrines of the English heretic which led to the condemnation of his forty-five articles in 1403, with which event the controversy begins to gain in real significance. For now, for the first time, *Wycliffe's general attack upon the entire foundations of the ancient Church*, which, moreover, had been particularly warm against *the ecclesiastical doctrine*, coalesced with the opposition against *abuses in practice and life*, and imparted to this latter its own radical character. In this way Huss was forced into a position which he by no means occupied in the beginning, and which he was even constantly at pains to decline. Huss was anxious about nothing so much as to purge himself from the charge of heresy. The accusation of being puffed up with a sense of his own importance was painful to his susceptible and humble mind, and whilst Wycliffe in his daring self-reliance hurled against the Church herself the charge of heresy—even in reference to articles of faith, such as transubstantiation, Huss even from his prison writes with touching earnestness to the Knight of Chlum, to be sure and not forget to impress on the queen, that she need not be under any apprehension of scandal on his part as though he were a heretic. Moreover, he repudiated every sort of intimate connexion and partnership with Wycliffe. Already at Prague, in 1403, he would not allow it to be asserted to his prejudice that he had said that all Wycliffe's forty-five articles were true, although by ascribing what was false in them, with the exception of the article,

*De corpore Christi*, to the falsification of a certain Dr. Hübner, he, nevertheless, evinces his inward leaning towards Wycliffe. The same is expressed in his well-known touching and beautiful wish: 'Would I might reach the place where the soul of Wycliffe is!'—*Jaeger*, pp. 92, 93.

In Jaeger's opinion Huss deceived himself as to the extent to which he had been influenced by Wycliffe. It was not mainly the philosophical writings of Wycliffe, as he said before the Council, which had first and especially attracted him. He had not merely imbibed and defended this or that particular doctrine of the English Reformer, but he held the *fundamental principle* in common with Wycliffe, and that, as our author thinks, in a still more profound, immediate, and living way than Wycliffe himself. His reasoning is as follows:—

'In support of this conclusion we cannot do better than appeal to his adversaries, to the Catholic Church, which in such questions has ever judged with all the keenness of a natural instinct. The Church had recognised in Wycliffe her most dangerous enemy, the man who had laid the axe to the root of her proud but corrupt tree. The Synod at Rome had ordered the writings of Wycliffe to be burnt, and had fulminated against him the curse of the Church. The Council of Constance, in its eighth session, in May, 1415, solemnly pronounced him a heretic, condemned his doctrine, and in its fanatical zeal ordained that his accursed bones should be dug up out of consecrated ground, and his earthly remains scattered upon the river.

Again, that the Council were for classing Huss altogether with Wycliffe, is particularly shown by its eagerness to fasten on Huss the heresies of Wycliffe, to which point his accusers always came back. The same thing appears in many of the speeches of the most eminent men in the Council, but especially in the *sentence*, in which the doctrines and the person of Wycliffe fill the foreground, and Huss is treated simply as an adherent and disciple of Wycliffe, and condemned to be burnt accordingly.

'Paletz, then, was quite right when he said to Huss, 'Since the birth of Christ no heretic has written more dangerously against the Church than thou and Wycliffe.' For it is just this phenomenon, that what had found in Wycliffe clear *dogmatic* expression, had at once assumed in Huss a direct *practical* shape—one-sidedly practical, it may be, but probably for that very reason all the more truly popular—it is just this fact, I say, which proves that in the Bohemian Reformer the new principle had already become *life and reality*, and had gained in depth and earnestness. This has been already pointed out in detail. The evangelical conception of the Church at once attains with Huss its practical application in what he says of the universal priesthood, and, if Gerson is to be believed in the articles of accusation which he drew up, the Reformer himself went so far as to maintain that every pious man has a right and is bound to teach and to preach (*quod omnis bene vivens secundum vitam Christi potest et debet docere palam*

et prædicare). The refusal to bow to the papal authority, which he is unable theoretically to carry through, he maintains simply by implication, in that he revolts against being hindered by the papal excommunication from the fulfilment of his duty as a preacher imposed on him immediately by God. So, too, if when he asserts the authority of Scripture he glances wistfully at tradition, and the holy *doctores*, nevertheless the study of his practical writings in particular, and of his whole personality, shows that with him the authority of Scripture had become a living power. They breathe throughout, and that far more than Wycliffe's, a spirit inwardly akin to the Gospel, and based on it alone. In Huss we meet with a really living and personal relationship to Christ, after which we see Wycliffe earnestly striving only. In this respect the reforming principle in Huss rises to a higher level than in Wycliffe, to whom he is decidedly inferior in importance, power, and clearness of intellect, and approaches in a marked degree the full pitch which it attains in Luther.

'A deeper study of history will not reproach us with a leaning to the magical and superstitious if we here mention also the marvellous insight and the prophetic element in Huss. It proves how full his mind was of the weal and woe of the Church; how this one thought swayed his soul. As an example of this trait, which is everywhere discernible, especially in his last peril, we adduce only that dream, of which he writes so touchingly from his prison:—'I saw how in Bethlehem\* men endeavoured to deface all the pictures of Christ, and they succeeded in doing so. Then on the next day I arose and saw a number of painters, who had painted many more and much finer ones. In like manner, I too hope,' he proceeds to say, 'that the life of Christ which by my ministry in Bethlehem has been painted by means of His word in the hearts of men, will be better painted and by more and better preachers than I; and with this prospect will I comfort myself.'—*Jaeger*, pp. 93—95.

Space will not be left us to enter into the particulars of the scarcely less interesting parallel between Wycliffe and the reforming Hollander, Wessel, the scholar of Thomas à Kempis and the teacher of Reuchlin. Until the Messrs. Clark, of Edinburgh, gave us, in our own language, Uhlmann's masterly work, *The Reformers before the Reformation*, Wessel was to English readers a great unknown. We wish we could here afford to do more than merely allow Jaeger to indicate the point of view whence he compares Wessel with Wycliffe.

'It now came to the turn of the second of the two tendencies which we have found united in Wycliffe to develop itself; I refer to the opposition against the hierarchical science, against scholasticism. This was the problem of that period of seeming repose and lassitude which succeeded to the exciting times of the great Councils of Basle and Constance. The representative of this second tendency is John

\* The chapel of that name at Prague in which he was wont to preach.

Wessel, and it is remarkable enough that he exhibits in his person this side of Wycliffe with the same one-sidedness as Huss the other. When great ideas make shipwreck for the moment, and the opposing forces triumph, it is in accordance with a natural law that an impulse develops itself, to gain by means of a reform from within outwards, and step by step, that which has not been yielded in the lump to stormy and revolutionary assaults. In such cases the new element has to be brought to full maturity, and to be carefully elaborated in the noiseless workshop of calm scientific retirement. In the time of which we speak this process was precipitated by the revival of the humanistic studies which were going on at that very epoch. This quietly creative spirit, which blended a tranquil, practical life with contemplative science—the Inner Mission, as it may be styled, of the fifteenth century—had its head-quarters in the Netherlands. In this country, in the societies of the Brethren of the Common Lot, we find a more peaceful renovation of the Lollards. Like Wycliffe's disciples, they lived according to the Gospel by the labour of their hands; they had introduced amongst themselves the community of goods in use amongst the first Christians, and studied in retirement the Gospel of love and science. Whilst Wycliffe's fiery nature infinitely preferred energetic action to slothful contemplation, and had zealously opposed everything like conventual life within stone walls, it was precisely this habit of retreating into the quiet of their cells, to which these brethren were indebted for the powerful spirit which animated their modest works of charity. No better illustration can be given of the contrast between Wycliffe's heroic struggles, and this love of retirement produced by intoxication of feeling, than the words of Florentius Raderius, one of the successors of the founder of the brotherhood, Gerhard Groot. 'Accustom thyself,' says he, 'to abide in thy chamber, and to read in a book until it is disagreeable and irksome to thee to quit it, but delightful to enter it.' And again: 'It is dangerous to converse with worldly dignitaries and spiritual lords; rather avoid the people of the world and great men.'

'Out of this brotherhood proceeded John Wessel, born 1419 at Gröningen, and to this cloistered retreat, furnished by his native land, did he return after having lived at Cologne, Paris, Rome, and Heidelberg, in contact with the most eminent scientific minds and ecclesiastical notabilities, everywhere doing good in the way of communicating instruction, and by means of friendly controversy, whenever it was possible without a deeper breach with the established order of things. Here in his own home he wrote most of his works, which, keeping the middle path between simple edification and science, bear throughout the same uniform character of mild and moderate opposition, free from all excitement, and of humble self-mistrust and genuine piety. It must be added that they bear also the stamp of an age wanting in the highest kind of productive power.'—*Jaeger*, pp. 102—104.

The general scope of the parallel with Luther may be gathered from the following brief retrospective survey of the whole subject:—



'We have seen the reforming principle complete a sort of cycle. Wycliffe shook from without the prison-house in which men's spirits lay bound, and toiled in rolling the first stones towards the new building. But though this blow made the whole edifice totter, yet it was not repeated, and it was not effectual on a grand scale. There was wanting to the new principle that inward power of life, which it was destined to discover in itself in a course of slow development, and as it became more deeply rooted, and that by means of a separate unfolding of each particular germ. This process took place in Huss and Wessel and their compeers. Luther united anew, as in a focus, the different diverging tendencies and reforming energies, and led them up to a higher stage; and in him the reforming principle has not simply reached its culmination in its doctrinal form, as he himself thought, but rather out of the teeming fulness of a great man, and of a wholly new view of life, it has shed the seeds of new impulses and new progressive instincts. Again, not as though the whole truth were now found out, in whose shadow we might comfortably repose, and perhaps in German fashion spin disputes about trifles, as did that great abortive century which followed the sixteenth with its mighty movements. Luther and the German Reformation have left a great portion of the problem unsolved, and, such being the case, we ought not in the feeling of our weakness to be above learning from the beginners of the Reformation things for which the great consummator of the work found neither himself nor his age ripe, and things of whose importance the present time seems to admonish us with loud voice. We mean the carrying out of the reforming principle on the arena of national life and of the State; a carrying out of the work, not, as our adversaries say with their wonted blindness in historical matters, identical with the French Revolution and French anarchy, but one which, both in Church and State, like to nothing save itself, means only legal, temperate, manly freedom and reformation from within outwards.'

Dr. Lechler, an able contributor to this department of literature in Germany, was first brought into notice by his prize work on *The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Age*, and by his *History of English Deism*. Of late he seems to have cherished a growing predilection for Wycliffe as his special subject. Hence his selection by Herzog (whose editorial tact in these matters is beyond all praise) to write the Lollard articles in the great *Protestant Theological and Ecclesiastical Encyclopædia*, now in course of publication at Stuttgart. Hence, too, his own choice of Wycliffe as his theme in his inaugural discourse delivered on the occasion of his taking possession of the Theological Chair at Leipzig a few weeks ago. The foundation of all these minor labours, however, is to be found in his series of papers in Niedner's *Zeitschrift für die Historische Theologie*, the years 1853 and 1854. These interesting papers are now before us, and afford ample testimony to the spirit of patient and conscientious research with which

inquiries of this sort are conducted by German scholars when once their attention is thoroughly called to them. What prompted Dr. Lechler to study the subject more closely, was the discreditable confusion of opinion on the Continent relative to Wycliffe and the Lollards, which he thus describes:—

‘Wycliffe’s importance as a forerunner of the Reformation is not uniformly recognised and finally set at rest to this day, even within the Protestant churches themselves. Neither his character and style of thought as an individual, nor the nature, measure, duration, and issue of the work begun by him, are known as they ought to be. Opinions differ widely, for instance, even as to whether Wycliffe has at all a right to be reckoned amongst the forerunners of the Reformation, properly so called, and his place amongst the ‘witnesses of the truth’ is warmly disputed. Again, as relates to the disciples whom he gathered round him, and the results which he brought about, men have just as little made up their minds, even at the present day. At the very outset we find the question undecided, whether in general the rise of a reforming party in England is to be set down so pre-eminently and even exclusively, as is commonly done, to the account of Wycliffe; or whether the influence of older sects, the Waldenses for example, was not an important factor in the business, so that at bottom Wycliffe could merely have furnished the decisive impulse to the open manifestation of views already current independent of him. Further, a great diversity of opinion prevails as to the measure in which the influence of Wycliffe permeated the English nation, and in particular whether his influence was felt mainly amongst the higher and cultivated classes, or actually laid hold of the heart of the people. There are questions, too, as to the nature of his influence, namely, whether he laboured in a one-sided manner merely to increase the stock of Christian knowledge, or brought about an outward ecclesiastico-political ferment, or was the author of a moral renovation and genuine religious awakening. Lastly, as regards the fortunes of the party after Wycliffe’s death, and the degree of success attending the measures adopted against it, we find in many historical works hazy and inadequate, or formally incorrect statements. Mostly the writers content themselves with remarking that till 1399 the Lollards were on the increase, and that then, for the first time, stringent measures were adopted in dealing with them, the severity of which became intensified from 1413. It is often imagined that the result of this bloody persecution was the total suppression of the party; whilst others have seen so much at least of the truth as to maintain that its free opinions were never quite rooted up again, and that many germs of Wycliffe’s sowing were preserved down to the Reformation.’—*Zeitschr. f. Hist. Theol.* 1853, Heft 3, s. 416, 417.

In the luminous papers before us, Dr. Lechler does his best to disabuse his countrymen of the manifold misconceptions current amongst them respecting Wycliffe and his followers. He treats

of their history in five periods, the first of which extends to Wycliffe's death (1384); the second ends with the elevation of the House of Lancaster to the throne (1399); the third with the martyrdom of Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham (1417); the fourth period is brought down to 1431, when the bloody persecution against the Lollards may be said to have culminated; and the fifth and last stretches down to the Reformation. Of these periods, the first alone more immediately concerns us here. Our author first gives a slight sketch of the Reformer's life, next a summary of his doctrines, and lastly, an estimate of his success. The review of his theology confines itself, for the most part, to the *Reforming* elements embodied in it. A very similar distribution is followed in the 'Inaugural Lecture,' which, indeed, may in general be regarded as our author's own *resumé* of his earlier production. We shall, therefore, borrow from its more compressed pages his account of Wycliffe's religious opinions:—

'As a theologian, Wycliffe is eminent, not only as a master of the scholastic method, but also by virtue of his healthy relish for the truth itself, his biblical bias, and his critical spirit. Jerome of Prague, who returned home to Bohemia from Oxford fourteen years after Wycliffe's death, says, in his enthusiasm for the man, 'Hitherto, men possessed nothing but the shell of science, Wycliffe was the first to discover the kernel.' But I am persuaded that had Wycliffe discovered the kernel without being, at the same time, master of the scientific form, which in his age was looked on as the main thing, he would, in the end, have met with nothing but depreciation, and especially from the very fact of his making the Bible the foundation. Those who, instead of reading over the great masters of scholasticism, read over the Bible itself, and drew immediately from the Bible, were nicknamed 'Biblicists,' and greeted with nothing but shrugging of the shoulders. And yet with what decision and loyalty did Wycliffe hold aloft the Bible! With ever-growing clearness and power his conviction breaks forth, that holy Scripture is alone entitled to supreme authority as the fountain and rule of Christian faith and life. He says, for instance, 'As Christ is infinitely exalted above every other man, so is Holy Scripture possessed of infinitely greater authority than any other book. Every truth which the pilgrim upon earth does not perceive by means of his senses, must, if it be entitled to belief, be drawn from the Holy Scriptures.' Indeed, in another passage, he makes the bold assertion, 'Were there a hundred popes, and were all the begging friars turned into cardinals, yet in matters of faith men would not be bound by their *dicta*, except so far as they were founded on the Bible.' This biblical bias was well known to his hearers as the Reformer's distinguishing characteristic; and hence, whilst other great schoolmen received names of honour, such as *Doctor Angelicus*, *Doctor Subtilis*, *Doctor Irrefragabilis*, &c., to Wycliffe was given the striking title, *Doctor Evangelicus*.

'This upholding of the authority of Scripture as the only decisive rule in matters of faith, this, so to say, formal principle, rests, as we at once see, on a material principle, and this latter runs thus—*To God alone be honour!* Christ and his merits *alone* are the ground of salvation, and God's free election in Christ is the unconditioned cause of the blessedness of all believers. \*Wycliffe earnestly insists on the point that honour is to be given to God alone, and overflows with zeal against all idolatry, which, for instance, he sees in this, that the commandments of men are ranked above the commandment of God, or that men swear by the saints, or that a monkish order usurps the honour which belongs to none but God, &c. That Jesus Christ, by virtue of his exalted person, as God and man, and of his merit, is the *only Mediator* between God and man, is with him a fundamental truth, to which he always appeals again and again against the invocation of the saints. The faith which saves must, for this reason, trust exclusively and wholly to Christ, and not to anything besides, whether the merits of the saints or one's own works. This faith must be 'a full belief of Christ.' Connected herewith is his doctrine touching *God's unconditional election*. This Augustinian doctrine Wycliffe makes his own in all earnestness, save that he does not, like Augustine, make the fall and human sinfulness and inability for good his starting-point, but God's omnipotence and government of the universe, unconditioned itself, but prescribing absolutely the conditions under which all things exist. In other words, he lays down, not an anthropological but a theological and speculative basis for the doctrine. In opposition to the superficial view of human sin, and the exaggerated estimate of human virtue, which lie at the basis of the Pelagian doctrine, in his eyes the infinitely gracious will in Christ, which works everything that is truly good, stood high above all. And accordingly, in his view, faith itself is a free gift of God's grace, and not a meritorious work. This belief, shaped in a corresponding way his conception of *the Church*; the holy church is nothing but the congregation of the elect; this is 'the true body of Christ' as opposed to the 'mixed or seeming body of Christ,' which includes within itself both elect and hypocrites. In other words, whilst the Romish mediæval view understood by the church the prelates and priests—the hierarchy, and did not, properly speaking, reckon the laity to the church, Wycliffe sets forth a conception of the church which, on the one hand, excludes all the impious and hypocrites, even if invested with church-office, whether high or low; and on the other hand, includes all true believers. And instead of making the salvation of individuals dependent throughout on church-office and the priesthood, he holds the immediate access to grace, *i.e.*, the universal priesthood of all believers. 'Faith,' says Wycliffe, 'is not built upon the Pope and his Cardinals, but upon the Holy Trinity and the God-man Jesus Christ, for other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.' Moreover, at the bottom of his lively opposition against the Romish doctrine of the *Lord's Supper*, lies the same zeal for the honour of God. In the mediæval church, the Eucharist, both doctrinally and

in its administration, had assumed a shape in which we Protestants must recognise a corruption. In three main points the institution of Christ and biblical truth had become perverted and falsified, viz., in the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, in the withholding of the cup from the laity, and in the dogma of transubstantiation. Wycliffe's attention had only been fastened upon the last, viz., the Roman Catholic doctrine that the bread and wine upon the altar, by virtue of consecration by the priest, are *changed* into the body and blood of Christ, in such a manner that nothing, save the *species*, or semblance and taste of bread and wine now remain, but that in reality it is only the body and blood of Christ which are there, for which reason the consecrated host must be worshipped as the real body of Christ. This doctrine Wycliffe declares to be contrary alike to reason and Scripture, pronounces it the most impious heresy which ever arose, and 'the abomination of desolation in the holy place,' spoken of in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew. There were two things which gave him such great offence—in the first place the formal worship paid to the host, which he says, is a making of God out of the creature, idolatry; and secondly, the fancy that the priest, by virtue of his consecration, could *make* (*conficere*) the body of Christ, a pretence which raises the honour of the priesthood to the skies: in this Wycliffe could see nothing else than a blasphemous making of God out of a man, and an anti-Christian self-exaltation of the clergy. As respects his own view, it is on the one side, clear and consistent, viz., that the bread and wine in the sacrament of the altar are, and remain, real bread and natural wine, as much after consecration as before it. But on the other side, as to the sense in which Christ's body and blood are to be discerned in the Lord's Supper, his view is vague and wavering. Sometimes he seems to allow the visible to be nothing more than a sign of the invisible, in which he approximates to the doctrine of Zwingli; at other times he acknowledges the true body of Christ in the Sacrament, so that he approaches the Lutheran confession. We may remark in general, that candour demands that we should not forget the difficulties which in reference precisely to this article, would stand in the way of a new and satisfactory doctrinal development, especially on a first attempt at a critical treatment of the Romish dogma.'

Dr. Lœbner has expressed his critical judgment on the principal biographies of Wycliffe. There are considerations which would preclude us from citing his language on this point, but there are other circumstances which seem to say that it should be given:—

'The best works on Wycliffe are the biographies of Lewis and Vaughan. The former was the first earnest attempt at a history of Wycliffe from its sources; and in fact, in addition to 105 pages of original citation, mostly Latin, in the Appendix, numerous proof passages are given in the work itself. What we miss in the book, however, is not only due elaboration, order, and clearness, but also a comprehensive acquaintance with Wycliffe's works. But although

this book remained to 1829 the only one drawn from the authorities, it was very little used. What Schneider remarks in the preface to the sixth volume of Neander's *Church History*--viz., that few of our church historians can ever have had the book in their hands--is certainly correct. . . . The new work--*The Life and Opinions of John de Wycliffe, D.D.*, by Robert Vaughan, is distinguished by an extensive study of the originals; and he has incorporated in his work a precious and well-arranged *florilegium* of citations from them. For example, he gives from the manuscript sermons of Wycliffe a number of valuable and highly illustrative passages, whereas, until the appearance of his work, no correct and satisfactory information as to those homilies was anywhere to be found. Besides all this, Vaughan may claim the distinguished merit of having been the first to arrange chronologically the writings of Wycliffe by the help of internal notes of time, whereby it became possible, for the first time, to point out the Reformer's inner course of development, and to defend him against traditional prejudices, especially against the charge of inconsistency or disingenuousness.

Professor Lechler regrets that Dr. Vaughan has not paid more attention to Wycliffe's philosophical speculations as a realist, and would have preferred that the extracts from Wycliffe's English works had been given with the strict *ipsissima verba* of the author; but he speaks of the work, on the whole, as dealing with its subject 'critically, cautiously, and with thoroughness,' and as being 'the only satisfactory elaboration of Wycliffe's life from the original sources.'

Winkelmann's Latin essay is the fruit of another university competition. The Theological Faculty of Gottingen, which had proposed the theme, were scarcely satisfied with the first draught, although they adjudged to it the prize; and they accordingly sent it back to the writer for correction before honouring it with their *imprimatur*. It is still, however, a somewhat crude performance; and their first judgment, pronounced through their Dean, the learned and genial Dr. Dörner, has been by no means wholly deprived of its sting by the subsequent revision. The Faculty says of it:—

'As a whole, with the exception of the part relative to the Reformation in the sixteenth century, the treatise is elaborated from the original sources, and, at the same time, does not omit to notice, not without a judicious estimate of their merits, the more recent literary productions. We find it, indeed, open to exceptions. It is a great deal too abruptly, and, here and there, too hurriedly written. It enters too little into such a general description of the historical situation with which it has to do as might help the reader in discovering his whereabouts, and allows the tendency to schematize—too evident in many places—to get the better of an unprejudiced appreciation of the real state of the case. It thereby often assumes too

abstract a tone, and becomes almost chargeable with injustice. . . This is especially to be remarked in reference to its treatment of Wycliffe. In particular it does not discuss in sufficient detail the relation of the previous reforming movements to the Reformation itself. With all these drawbacks, however, the essay displays a lively and agile intellect, acuteness and solidity of judgment, and a not altogether unsuccessful endeavour to learn the nature of the phenomena from the inner heart of the spiritual powers concerned in their production. The delineation of Gerson and his theology is entitled to marked commendation.'

That Dr. Dorner and his colleagues should have classed Gerson, the bitter persecutor of Huss, as a Reformer along with his victim, will surprise no one who remembers the part played at Constance by the great Chancellor of Paris, and his bearing there towards the papacy. His prescription for the sick church was, in reference to doctrine, a blending of the scholastic and mystic theologies; and as regards polity, the substitution of an aristocratic ecclesiastical regimen by means of decennial general councils in the place of the papal autocracy.

In the following passage Winkelman places Gerson quite upon a par with Wycliffe—altogether erroneously, as might easily be shown, and only by depreciating the latter most unfairly.

'Since Wycliffe, with his disciples, showed that God is revealed in holy Scripture, and insisted that all truths are to be drawn thence, he might seem to deserve the name of a Reformer far more than Gerson. In the main, however, they are entitled to the same credit; for Wycliffe did not learn more from his new source than Gerson discovered by his own genius (!)—which yet is not to be taken in the sense that their sentiments were in general the same; on the contrary, they taught opposite truths. It must be granted, however, that no man has seen everything. Gerson believed that God is love, but forgot that He is just. Wycliffe, on the other hand, was above all things concerned to inculcate the truth that He is just. The former decides that the world is governed by grace; the latter, that it is ruled by justice and penalties. The former esteemed the contemplative life the highest grade of perfection; the latter never ceased to proclaim that God's righteous law must be done and fulfilled. Both, accordingly, found God, but the one scarcely recognises the God of the other; and this difference in their opinions concerning God is the cause of their disagreement as to what men are to do, and as to the way to the blessed life.

'Wycliffe seems to have deduced the justice of God, not from his contemplation of the universe, but from his study of human nature, under the guidance of his own intellect. For since he affirms that God is 'everything, whose existence is better than its non-existence' (*Trial*. 12), it is difficult to say why he should have chosen to say that God is just (*Trial*. 13), rather than that God is love, unless because he found the truth that God is just, and that wickedness will be punished,

ingrained in his very nature. For he declares that God and the law are one and the same, and is wont to style the whole of holy Scripture the law or rule of Christ or of God. In one passage, indeed, he says that 'the Scripture denotes Jesus Christ the Book of Life' (*Trinl.* 175), but he adds, 'in which all truth is written;' and since he regarded the law as truth rather, he did not come to conceive of it as life, as Jaeger rightly remarks (p. 139).<sup>\*</sup> What Vaughan has observed (i. 331) is indeed true, that in Wycliffe's writings the law of Christ means all God's communications to men; but then to him these same things which have been revealed by God seem to be little else than God's commandments. Even in that passage which I have just cited he says nothing concerning the *life* with which Scripture is instinct, but speaks of the law only, and of what is the more glorious import of Scripture in the popular estimation; and elsewhere he styles the Decalogue the crown of God's law, that is, of Scripture (*Vaugh.* ii. 322). Moreover, in those of his books which were written for the unlettered, and in his sermons, he is ever saying that the will of God is revealed in holy Scripture, and that we may learn therefrom how to live aright (*Vaugh.* ii. 19—26). Lastly, if he makes mention of the Gospel—which, indeed, he very seldom does—the Gospel is introduced not as an annunciation of the Gospel, so to speak, but as an issuing of commands' (*Vaughan*, ii. 23).—*Winkelmann*, pp. 30, 31.

No doubt our essayist's judges had something of this sort in view when they hinted at his having in his haste, and love of *schematism*, wronged the English Reformer's memory. Wycliffe, although, of course, he had not so clear a perception of the evangelical aspect of revelation as Luther, was anything but the legalist—we had almost said Pelagian—here portrayed. To one who was no less decided a predestinarian than Augustine and his own master Bradwardine before him, or than Calvin after him, this was simply impossible; and it is scarcely necessary, in such a case, to appeal from so crude a judgment to the infinitely better informed and maturer estimate of Lewald, as indicated in the following brief extract:—

'Wycliffe's theory of grace and predestination forms the centre of his theological doctrine; and we soon see that his efforts as a Reformer ripen on a soil on which, at least, the tares of pride in one's own merits and conceited self-righteousness cannot take root and thrive; whilst, on the other hand, the germ of the various doctrinal corruptions and practical abuses, of which he was the antagonist, sprung up and grew in the soil of that semi-pelagianism, which is so much more kindly for the production of such tares. 'He is a believer,' says Wycliffe (*Dial.* l. iii. c. 2, fol. 47,) 'who possesses faith as something shed into his heart immediately from God,

<sup>\*</sup> Jaeger is misrepresented here. He merely says, 'This sentence never became a full reality with Wycliffe. He stopped at the word 'Book,' and never got so far as the word 'Life.'



mingled with no contrary affection of fear or despondency.' We may combine with this the passage in a sermon in which he 'thus expresses himself on the same subject:—'We ought to know that faith is a gift of God, and that it cannot be given to men otherwise than of grace. Therefore, every good which men possess is from God. Accordingly, when God rewards any good work of a man, He crowns His own gift. Even this is in like manner of grace, just as all things which men possess according to the will of God are of grace. God's goodness is the primary reason why he bestows on man any good thing; and thus God can do good to man no otherwise than freely and of grace; and it is only in a sense agreeable with this rule that it is correct to say that man deserves anything of God' (*Vaughan*, vol. ii. p. 33 sq.)—*Zeitsch. f. d. Hist. Theol.* 1846. Heft, 2 ss. 184, 185.\*

Professor Weber of Heidelberg, in what claims to be the first 'original' German history of the English Reformation, has, of course, to speak of Wycliffe's share in bringing it about. We are sorry to find, however, that the Reformer does not fill the space in this history which the promise held out in the super-scription to the first volume naturally leads us to expect. 'The Lollards' occupy, out of nearly seven hundred pages, not more than eighty, of which under fifty are assigned to Wycliffe. The author, too, has fallen into the same error with which Jäger justly charges Neander (whom, indeed, he seems to have too servilely copied in this matter), by treating of 'Wycliffe and the Lollards' under the strange heading: 'The Theological Science of the Middle Ages in Relation to the Dominant Church System.' He has, however, happily avoided the error of Winkelmann, as pointed

\* Neander has some just observations on this point, and on the tendency of Wycliffe's view respecting it. Wycliffe was entangled in the old scholastic view of the doctrine of Justification. He gave special prominence to the subjective side of this doctrine; and hence he agreed with Augustine and the schoolmen on this point, that no one could have certainty whether he belonged to the elect or not. It is evident that in this case as in that of Augustine and the Thomists, this might be held in perfect consistency with his referring everything to grace alone, and placing free-will utterly in the background. And hence, too, Wycliffe might sometimes give prominence to the trust of a Christian in the consciousness of his own pious life, though he regarded everything in that life as being but a work of Divine grace. Accordingly, he says, when God rewards a good work he crowns his own gift. Hence, too, we may with Vaughan (vol. ii. 359) compare Wycliffe with Luther in his views of the doctrine of Justification. But trust in the redemption by Christ is, in truth, made the central point also by the scholastic theologians of the thirteenth century. Yet in making this subjective conception of Justification his point of departure, and deriving everything from the divine fellowship of life with Christ, he came to a more profound and spiritual conception of the Church, as an inward unity to be traced to the same common *inward* fact, in contradistinction from the *outward* unity contended for on the position held by the Church. 'Holy Church,' he says, 'is the congregation of just men, for whom Christ shed his blood, and not mere stones and timber, and earthly dross, which the priests of antichrist magnify more than the righteousness of God, and the souls of men' (*Vaughan*, ii. 279) - all who shall be saved in the bliss of heaven are members of holy Church, and no more.'—*Hist. Reformation Movements in England*.

out by his judges—he has not neglected to take account of the political situation and the general physiognomy of the times, and his remarks in particular on the influence of the dynastic change at the accession of Henry IV. on the fortunes of the Lollard cause are valuable. He first gives a brief biographical sketch of Wycliffe (i. pp. 54—91); next comes a still more compendious analysis of his opinions on the priesthood and the church, religion and worship (pp. 92—101); and lastly, an account of Lollardism down to the Reformation (pp. 102—135). The descriptive portions are graphic, though not at the expense of historical truth; and the vivid impression left on the reader's mind of the wide spread of Wycliffism in this country during the few years before and after the Reformer's death deserves special mention. The doctrinal summary is a rather perfunctory performance—tolerably correct and not intolerably dull.

The *Life of Wycliffe* by Friedrich Böhringer, published in 1856, is the first work, in a series, on the biographical history of the early Reformation to which the author has pledged himself. It extends to more than six hundred octavo pages, and its view of the life and doctrine of Wycliffe is, as a whole, the best that has appeared in Germany. The *Life of the Reformer* extends through the first hundred and fifty pages, and is of course derived from English sources. On the doctrines of Wycliffe the author prosecutes his own independent analysis, but avails himself freely of the labours of Professor Lewald. He complains that Lewis does nothing with the doctrines of Wycliffe, and that Dr. Vaughan has not gone into that subject more thoroughly and systematically. As may be expected, he is himself very full and very methodical on that topic—much more so we suspect than would accord with the patience of ordinary English readers, and even with that of most English students. It is a work, however, which will do its part towards placing Wycliffe in his true position before the mind of the Germans. So the right comes round at last. This world can be long forgetful of some of its greatest men. The following is the form in which the doctrine of Wycliffe is presented by Böhringer:—

‘*Wycliffe as a Theologian*.—The Existence of God—the Trinity—the Divine Attributes—the Divine Ideas—the Divine Omnipotence and Causality—Necessity and Freedom—Moral Evil—Predestination—the World—Angels—Man—the Fall—Original Sin.

‘On Redemption.—Necessity of the Incarnation—Person of Christ—Work of Christ—Salvation.

‘Eschatology.—Immortality of the Soul—Purgatory—Resurrection—the Judgment—State of the Saved—of the Lost.

‘Ethics.—The Virtues (Ethical, Theological)—Sin (Venial Sin and Mortal)—the Seven Virtues and Sins.

'*Wycliffe as a Reformer.*—The Bible—Translation of the Bible—Reason and Revelation—Scholastic Philosophy—the Fathers—the 'New' Teachers.

'Sacraments.—Baptism—Lord's Supper—Confirmation—Ordination—Marriage—Penance—Extreme Unction.

'On Worship.—Evangelical Worship—Worship of Saints.

'The Church.—Idea of the Church—the Empirical Church—the Decline—the Priesthood—the Pope—the Clergy.

'Reform of the Church.—In General.—Preaching—Clergy—Lords—the Crown—the People—the 'Poor Priests'—the Free Congregations—Prospects.

'Wycliffe and the Friars.—Monachism—Civil Affairs—Characteristics of Wycliffe—his Relation to the Reformers of the Sixteenth Century.'

We may select, as illustrating the sobriety with which this author investigates the Reformer's opinions, his observations on the doctrine of Wycliffe concerning dominion as founded in grace. The propounding of this doctrine in some of the earlier writings of Wycliffe brought upon him much trouble, and during his later years much of what he writes is intended to correct misconception on this subject—misconception, in fact, on which he ought to have calculated. His belief was, as we have elsewhere said, that all men hold their gifts from God, as being, in the feudal sense, chief over all; that they hold these gifts on conditions; that these conditions being violated, the gifts are forfeited, and that mortal sin involves such forfeiture. In other words, the gifts of God are for those who know how to use them: the man living in mortal sin is sure to abuse them, and thus will give evidence that in his case they are in the wrong hands. But by mortal sin, Wycliffe meant not an act, but a state, a condition of habitual and hardened impiety—in short, the sin against the Holy Ghost. Even yet, however, Böhringer goes on to say—

'It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that Wycliffe speaks only of an ideal order of things, not as existing in the world, but viewed in itself, as it is, and should be, before God. He says himself, referring to Hos. viii., that he means such and such things as 'before God:' before the 'face of God.' It is also true that he does not look upon these views as purely ideal in regard to the Church, but that there he comes within the province of reality. We are not, however, therefore to conclude, as his enemies have done, that he would and must of necessity thus act in civil affairs.'

Böhringer joins in the now common lament over the neglect of Wycliffe on the part of his countrymen:—

'The German Reformers of the sixteenth century never accorded to

Wycliffe that frank, impartial acknowledgment which was due to him, owing probably to the lack of accurate historical information. Between him and the Reformers of the Swiss school there is however a specific resemblance. This is true with regard even to personal character: pure intellect without, mythic, contemplative, romantic elements, overruling imagination and feeling, combined with a stern temperament like that of Calvin. There is also the same gradual progress from the old errors toward a new knowledge, without 'painful outburst in one great deed,' as we find with Luther, and the same rational tendency, giving to reason its due place in divine things. The protestation against ecclesiastical abuses was also more energetic in these reformed churches than in that of Germany; they looked directly to the original apostolic Christianity and its outward form, rather than to an historical chain of usage; their whole moral and religious acceptance of Christianity was in fact identical.'—p. 606.

The following is Böhringer's idea of the mental history of the English Reformer:—

'It does not seem probable that he passed through any very severe struggles, from the peculiarities of his disposition. We should rather suppose him to have become gradually freed from the thralldom of the age, to have progressed step by step toward his riper views of evangelical doctrine. It was the external form of the Church and its secular corruptions, which first forced itself irresistibly upon him. He then began to consider the Church as a whole, rather than in its visible and hierarchial relations. At length he reached the doctrinal points, not the old Christian dogmas, but those new Middle-age ones which the Church then held to be of most importance—the ecclesiastical purpose of the Sacraments, especially of the Communion.'—p. 596.

In his general estimate of the character of Wycliffe, Böhringer marks especially his strong Biblical and rational tendency.

'Moreover, a religious and strong personality was necessary, in which these truths should become as it were living flesh and blood. A character which in its conscious repose on the truth and fidelity of divine grace has courage, from this immovable rock, to testify before the world, without fear of human authority, which could neither add to nor take from it. Above all, a *heart* for the 'people of Christ;' and this truly our Wycliffe never lacked. It is to him as much a necessity as a duty to 'save souls' whom he sees 'entangled' and 'lost' under ecclesiastical rule. . . . This loving zeal for the safety of souls dictated those pamphlets which have reference to the enlightenment of the people, and which compose the larger and later portion of his works. It impelled him, finally, to the translation of the Bible into the common tongue. Whatever be the subject occupying heart, mind, and hand,—the law of God, or its perversion by the inventions of man, the right of the nation to its undisturbed possession, or the struggle against the monks and against a secularized church—be the important question what it may, he makes it a matter of conscience to

explain it to the people, and to assist them in recovering the 'early freedom in Christ.'—p. 593.

'There is yet another feature necessary to complete our picture of this Reformer: one possessed by other reforming spirits who have taken hold upon the inner life of their fellow-countrymen—his strong nationality, his patriotism and political zeal. Not that his influence in the latter respect was *immediate*, he would thus only have fallen into the same fault which he reproved in his opponents, the men of the ruling Church, but indirectly by the light often thrown upon State affairs by his Christian ideas. In this direction he worked in different ways. Taking, in ecclesiastical and political affairs, the position, we might almost say, of a consul to the Parliament and other nobles, a relation which has been not inaptly compared to that existing between Okkam and the Emperor Louis. With person, word, and pen he stands at the service of every national ecclesiastical movement. He was equally anxious to free both State and people from a hierarchy, for whose foundation he had vainly searched the Scriptures. In thus emancipating the State, and the spirit of the nation, he believed the Church to be best served, since it was occupied more with such matters than with its first duty—the preaching of the Gospel and the spiritual care of souls.'—p. 595.

The following notice of what we may call the temper and thoroughness of Wycliffe's ultimate course as a Reformer is just and noteworthy.

'With regard to the defects and weaknesses of Wycliffe, that which appears to us most apparent is a want of *moderation*. In his thoughts and labours as a Reformer, we especially note this immediate contrasting of the divine and the human, the external and the internal. In the ecclesiastical condition of his time he acknowledges nothing but human inventions, existing in obvious contradiction to its earlier simpler state. To have the one or the other of such innovations removed would not satisfy him, the very foundation must be cleared. Of all the Middle-age Reformers he is by far the most radical.'

The great fault of Böhringer's work is the cautiously neutral, and purely scientific tone which, for the most part, pervades it. The aim of the writer in general is, to acquit himself with all the calmness of a judge, and the case is often judged as though no great interest, nothing beyond the fate of certain small ingenuities which have grown up among polemics, were at stake. This indifferentism never made such men as Wycliffe, and it will never give us the biography of such men as it should be written. We do not of course want the one-sidedness of the partisan—but we do want a firm belief in the reality of truth, and in the fact that the tendencies of truth are on the side of humanity.

Mr. Cowell's paper on *Wycliffe* is the essay to which the Stanhope prize was awarded in Oxford in 1857. The author is of Wadham College—one of Mr. Shirley's pupils we presume.

But Mr. Cowell does not concern himself about authorities, touches nothing controversial, and discourses through his thirty handsomely printed pages in a very general and harmless manner. What thought there is in these pages is intelligent, but it is sadly beaten out, and overlaid with words. The style, indeed, is quite after the academic model—elongated, elaborately balanced, and so smoothed down and polished that you are in danger at every step of taking sound for sense. It is a style which young men at college are often at great pains to learn, and afterwards, if they ever come to anything, take quite as much pains to unlearn. Had Wycliffe written thus, he might have sent forth books at the rate of a cartload a month, and have done nothing.\*

Much that is now written about Wycliffe would, we suspect, be a sorry business in his estimation were he to revisit us.

\* We feel disposed, before we conclude, to offer a word or two more about Wycliffe's wardenship of Canterbury Hall.

1. In reply to Mr. Pratt's note in a preceding page (387). Mr. Shirley thinks it enough to say (p. 519), that 'Dominus was the ordinary style of a priest whenever there was no question of his degree.' Now it is true, that in documents of some length, and where the same name occurs frequently, the word Dominus, or Magister, might be given to a Master of Arts interchangeably—just as the name of Master or Doctor is given interchangeably to Wycliffe by Cunningham, in the paper which Mr. Shirley has printed, and where that writer describes the Reformer as Doctor for the first time. But this is something very different from the brief, formal, and official entry of a name in a register, or in a legal document. That this 'Whyteclive's' name should appear in four archiepiscopal registers, and in the probate of his will, and in all these instances with the word Dominus, and never with the word Magister attached to it, is proof, if anything well can be, that he had no right to the title of Master, and was in fact a person 'who, though favoured with high patronage, finished his course apparently as the commonplace men of all time have done, leaving no trace of power behind him' (*Jean de Wycliffe, a Monograph*, 61); or who was, in the later words of Mr. Pratt, 'an ordinary man, who owed his promotion to some accident.'

2. But the following extract contains what Mr. Shirley describes as a 'cogent argument.' 'The Reformer was a Doctor of Divinity at the very latest in 1366, and before that was a Bachelor of Divinity for some time. In December, 1365, the warden of Canterbury Hall, in his deed of appointment, is styled Master of Arts; and in the statement of his cause before the Papal court, which must be dated 1368 or 1369, he is spoken of as a Bachelor of Divinity, that is to say, at a time when the Reformer was a Doctor, of at least two, and probably of five or six years' standing' (p. 527). It is natural to ask here—why the Wycliffe of Canterbury Hall must be *always* described by his proper degree, and the Whyteclive of Mayfield *never*? For so, according to Mr. Shirley, the case stands! But this 'cogent argument' is worthless on other grounds. The notion that Wycliffe took his Doctor's degree at the latest in 1366 is a mere notion. We have shown that it is not proved.

3. The fact that Wodeford's explicit statement on this point does not appear to have been repeated for some time to come, will hardly appear strange, if we bear in mind that Canterbury Hall was a very small and a very poor foundation, affording scanty assistance to not more than a dozen persons; that Wycliffe showed himself, by his conduct, to be not much concerned about the issue of the suit; and that he soon rose to such a position as to render it absurd to attribute a career so potent to a cause so trivial.

Men can now bestow their authorship upon him, whose narrowness and selfishness make it certain that they would have been found in the first rank of his traducers and persecutors had they lived in his time. Your fathers killed the prophets, and you build their sepulchres. He who cared so much about the duty of the hour, so little about the fame of the future, would look with small favour on the little disputations concerning the affairs of his life with which men having little real sympathy with his character have become disposed to employ themselves. His own life was a life of honest and self-forgotten labour, and the lives of other men rose in his estimation only as they were lives of that order. But it will, we trust, be seen from what precedes, that enough has been done in the time of the present generation, to ensure that the great English Reformer will have something like his due place in the history of Christian thought in the time to come.

ART. V.—*The Catechism of Positive Religion.* Translated from the French of Auguste Comte. By RICHARD CONGREVE, M.A. London: John Chapman.

'PROFESSING themselves wise, they became fools.' Certainly these words, however applicable to many of the ancient philosophers, are equally so to many modern, and perhaps to the author of the *Catechism of Positive Religion* more than all. So puerile, so silly, so driveling (if we knew of any stronger word we should use it), is this entire volume, both in conception and execution, that no other alternative is left for many of M. Comte's admirers than the unpleasant one of supposing that just when, in his own estimation, he had put the cope-stone on the system of 'Positivism,' and annihilated all the 'theologies,' he unluckily went mad, and that this volume of inanities is the sign and consequence thereof. For our own parts, we believe that when he composed this volume he was just as much in his senses as he ever had been,—at least for many a year. Plenty of the absurdities which make this volume so exquisitely foolish had long been held by M. Comte, and proclaimed in his previous writings; they are simply exhibited here with more startling flagrancy, and in combination with others of newer, but perfectly congenial character. His overweening vanity had long led him to the notion that his 'Positivism' was destined to revolutionize the whole world of thought, to annihilate theology in all its forms, and to banish God out of the world; or rather

to make man a sort of God himself. Long before the publication of this volume he had emulated the ridiculous blasphemy of Alphonso of Spain, and said that, so far from the works of nature being worthy of unqualified admiration, it was quite possible for M. Comte to suggest admirable improvements in them; that so far from the heavens declaring the glory of God, they declared no other glory than that of Hipparchus, Newton, and others who had discovered the laws of the celestial motions! These and such like things he said many years ago. One single characteristic, however, is sufficient to stamp him as a man utterly incapable of teaching or learning from experience—namely, his ever confident faith that his Positivism would *soon* explode God and all ‘theologies’ out of existence!

For if any one thing is plain from the history of all ages and nations, it is that man must have a God or Gods, *will* speculate as to the causes of things (which M. Comte ‘positively’ forbids him), and will have a theology, let it be ever so false, sooner than have none; aye, and account it a thousandfold more precious than the most philosophical atheism that a thousand M. Comtes could construct, though they all laid their heads together. To hope, therefore, for the triumphs M. Comte with such prodigious vanity hoped for, and proclaimed to be his expectation long ago, showed a mind utterly incapable of learning the lessons of universal history; and if he deserves to be called ‘mad’ for his follies now, he equally deserved to be called ‘mad’ then. Even supposing atheism ever so true, all *induction* shows that it is a truth to which it would require many millions of years to make half a million of proselytes.

In fact, spite of all the nonsense of this volume, M. Comte, when he composed it, was in *one* sense a little wiser than he was at an earlier period of his Positive speculations, for he learned at last to recognise the truth that the religious principle in man is indestructible, and demands, and must have its culture and development; and he has accordingly provided for it in the very queer way expounded in this volume. Though undisguised atheism is still his basis, be it known to the reader that he professes to found thereon a nobler religion than any yet preached among mankind; provides, in ‘Collective Humanity,’ a new Supreme as the object of it, and rekindles the extinguished hopes of a heaven, (seemingly lost for ever,) by a charming possibility of posthumous, though of course *unconscious*, incorporation with his ‘Grand Etre’ himself; or, as M. Comte calls it, by ‘subjective immortality.’—But we are anticipating; we shall presently give, in his own language, a summary of his fantastical system.

The truth is, that M. Comte’s merits as a speculator have been prodigiously over-rated, and his followers are beginning to awake



up to an unpleasant consciousness of that fact. It is the case of Titania coming to her senses, and detecting the long ears of her innamorato, Bottom; so his admirers would fain represent M. Comte as having, poor man! lost his senses, when the real difficulty is to find out, (if extravagances such as those of this volume, or similar extravagances, are to prove that he has lost his senses,) at what remote period he may be charitably supposed to have been in possession of them.

That M. Comte's attainments in mathematical and physical science were very profound cannot be doubted, and it is a point that has been often and ungrudgingly conceded.\* Even there, indeed, he has given no proof that he deserves to rank with the great *discoverers* who have added large domains to science; no proof of his being entitled to rank with Archimedes, Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, or Laplace. Still, his attainments in these sciences must be admitted; but then examples, not a few, assure us that a man may be profoundly learned in one department and a very baby in another; keen-eyed in subjects that admit of demonstrative evidence, and dull as an owl in those which admit only of moral. It is so with M. Comte. There is hardly one of the characteristic tenets of what he claims as especially *his* philosophy that is not either a fallacy or a pure assumption. That all mankind were *originally* Fetichists is a pure assumption, and one that, in fact, very few will tolerate; that those who have been Fetichists have been so in exclusive virtue of the reason M. Comte assigns—that is, because they endow all the inanimate things they worship with 'life and volition'—is another assumption, though an easy way of accounting for the infinite caprices which have, in turn, determined the Fetichists to worship an old oyster-shell, or a bright pebble, or a bone of some ancestor's great toe, or a rag of his ragged vestments—these just as fervently as sun or moon, or genius of forest or fountain! That polytheism has been uniformly and necessarily an evolution from Fetichism, and has always followed it, is another assumption just as gratuitous as the first; that the transition from polytheism to monotheism is the next, and inevitably necessary stage, is another; for the greater part of mankind still believe that men began with being monotheists and relapsed into polytheism; in fact the examples of polytheistic communities, becoming spontaneously and from within, monotheists, are extremely rare. That monotheism, the last of his three religious conditions, never preceded either of the other two, is another assumption; it is of course, not only contested by all who believe in the origin of the race, as given alike by general

\* See in this journal a long and elaborate article on M. Comte's system, 1854.

tradition and revelation, but is contradicted by authentic history, there having been many cases of whole nations who have fallen from monotheism into polytheism with surprising facility; — a process but too often repeated by the Jews. That there is a constant tendency, with the progress of science, to throw off all 'theology,' and to become atheistical, is another assumption. The scientific men in Bacon's time, in Newton's, in our own, the immense majority of scientific men of all time, exhibit not the smallest tendency to abandon all 'theology;' whereas, if M. Comte's theory were true, there ought to be by this time hardly a scientific man that was not an atheist. Even in this sceptical age, with all M. Comte's 'positivism' to help, those who are taking his course may still be numbered by units, and are never likely to be many. Whatever men become they will not abandon all the 'theologies;' they still stick at that obstinate monotheism which is M. Comte's chief aversion, and more odious to him, apparently, than Fetichism itself.

In striving to make out these and half-a-dozen other assumptions, M. Comte deals with history as with a nose of wax: founds the most sweeping generalizations on the most limited and insignificant data, and often in defiance of all data; fairly turning facts upside down for the purpose of proving his conclusions. Indeed, whatever his scientific attainments, nothing can be more clear than that his knowledge of history was, like his knowledge of everything else except mathematics and the dependent sciences, very limited and very inaccurate. He talks about the 'theological stage,' and the 'metaphysical stage,' and the 'positive stage' as if they were separated by a sharp line of demarcation; whereas, so far as they express anything at all, they express only certain tendencies which may co-exist both in the individual and in society, and, in both cases co-exist in perpetuity. We are sagely told that a solar eclipse is understood, and predicted to a fraction of a moment by 'positive science,' but in the 'theological epoch' it was believed that some 'dragon had swallowed the sun!' Were not eclipses foretold and explained, by those who still retained an ample 'theology,' with just as much precision before the author of the 'positive' method was born or thought of? and have they been a whit better understood, explained, or predicted in virtue of M. Comte's having got rid of the 'theological stage?' Similarly, he chooses to represent all people in the 'theological epoch' or 'metaphysical epoch' as partaking in similar absurdities. To believe in one all-perfect and infinite God is just the same as to believe in the Cock-lane ghost, and is equally easily explained by the 'theological epoch.' To believe in the efficacy of prayer addressed to such a being is

just as absurd as to fancy that there is truth in astrology and conjuration. In the 'theological stage' the 'positivist' will have it that everybody believes the world a theatre in which the 'arbitrary wills' and 'transient caprices' of superior powers play their unaccountable pranks.

Accordingly, another strange fallacy of M. Comte is the notion that, presuming all the phenomena of the universe to be subject to *law*, they cannot have originated in any supreme will, for that the acts of will are essentially capricious; just as if it were not more easy to ascribe order to a perfect will acting under the guidance of wisdom than to fate or chance! It has been well remarked that this paradox of M. Comte is the more flagrant, that the only 'wills' M. Comte recognises are in his system under the dominion of 'law' as much as anything else. Now, if it be possible that the phenomena to which our volitions give rise may be in harmony with law, why may not the phenomena of the universe have been similarly originated by a supreme will?—An equal fallacy of M. Comte is the complacent one in which he proposes to get rid of all the arguments for a Deity from the adaptations and marks of design in the universe. They prove, he says, nothing more than that things exist, because the conditions of existence meet in them: if they did not meet, things would not exist; a theory which is about as respectable as Epicurus' fortuitous concourse of atoms: in addition to which it may be said that we have but to open our eyes to see that it is utterly beside the purpose; for the greater part of the supposed 'conditions of existence' are not conditions of existence merely, but of well-being. The world might have existed, but yet have been indefinitely more miserable than it is.

But we must not dwell just now on the numerous errors of M. Comte's general speculations; we must hasten to give the reader a brief account of the incomparable volume in which he provides for the future religion of the world. As to the style of the book, suffice it to say, that it is tedious beyond the tediousness even of M. Comte's ordinary manner; while even *that*, compared with the style of any of the great exponents of human thought and masters of language, reminds one of a broad-wheeled waggon as compared with a railway train. The book is in the form of dialogue (we may well say *form*, for every vestige of reality is wanting), and M. Comte gives, in his usual tedious way, several pages in explanation of his reasons for adopting this form:—  
'Fresh from the work of constructing the positive theory of human language, I felt at once that since expression must ever have the communication of thought as its object, its *natural*

'form is the dialogue.\* Unfortunately, M. Comte's is not dialogue in any *natural* form. Again—'In accordance with this theory as to the peculiar didactic form to be adopted, I was led, not only to justify the custom which had hitherto prevailed, but even to *improve upon it*, so far as the second person in the 'dialogue is concerned.† Spirit of Plato! The 'improvements' are something like the notable 'improvement' of substituting 'sal ammoniac' for the ancient 'natron' in the soup at Smollett's classical dinner. Except in the recurrence of the names of the two interlocutors, 'Priest' and 'Woman,' there is little in M. Comte's book that looks like dialogue.

The dullest *Catechism* ever penned is vivacity itself compared with M. Comte's. It consists of the most wearisome monologues with not a syllable to indicate dramatic verisimilitude or the life and movement of conversation, except a dull form at the beginning of each speech; something in this way:—'*Woman*. After your admirably clear explanation, may I request you, &c. *Priest*. If you will only remark, my daughter, what was formerly said, &c. *Woman*. I thank you, my father, for so completely satisfying my mind; I now entirely subscribe your doctrine, &c., and nothing can be more beautiful,' &c.—But it is well that a book which is unblushingly designed to trample on all those great truths and sentiments which can alone evoke real genius, should not be adorned by one ray of it, but be cursed, as it is, with the very spirit of tedium and dulness.

The circumstances under which M. Comte was impelled to provide the world with a religion (for which his earlier philosophy seemed, by its annihilation of the Deity, to leave small place) were very peculiar, and require a little explanation. The 'affective and religious development' of his own nature awaited an accident of middle life; but for this it is probable that the world would have been left in fatal ignorance of even the possibility of that only scheme of true 'religion' which this Catechism *reveals*. It was a narrow escape for us. It may be thought a trifling drawback from M. Comte's qualifications for regenerating the world, that he so nearly left it without having any suspicion that this vast supplement to humanity was necessary; without any suspicion that his 'Positivism' had positively neglected what he now deems the most important element in human nature—the religious susceptibility. It is true that, as every reader will feel, he makes odd provision for it, and when the child of humanity asks 'bread' and 'fish,' gives him 'stones and

\* Preface, p. 15.

† Preface, p. 18.

scorpions;' still he admits the urgency of the need. However, we must not dwell on the inconsistencies with his earlier speculations; for it would take a folio fully to exhibit them. Suffice it to say, that M. Comte seems to have happily discovered at the mature age of forty-two, or thereabout, that he had 'affections' and 'religious propensities;' the electrical spark which evoked the knowledge which has thus been the salvation of the world, was his *liaison* with Madame Clotilde de Vaux—a lady separated from her husband, as was, we believe, M. Comte from his wife; altogether a position of things which the reader would little suspect to be propitious to a great moral and religious inspiration. Madame de Vaux seems to have been a George-Sand-sort of person, but a little more coarse, and taught M. Comte a trifle of love in return for his 'Positive' illuminations. She is the 'woman' in these dialogues, and if truly represented she must undoubtedly have been the most docile of catechumens; but at the same time the most tiresome and tedious of all creatures that ever walked in petticoats. To do her justice, however, it is no 'woman' at all, but just the double of M. Comte.

The obligations under which the world is laid to Madame Clotilde de Vaux for having chafed M. Comte's latent religion into life, without which we must have been ignorant of the *Grand Être* and destitute of the glorious hopes of a 'subjective,' that is, *unconscious* 'immortality,' are inconceivably great, and so M. Comte represents them. Nay, he begs that this his 'guardian angel' may share with him the veneration of all his disciples.—But his account of his feelings is worth giving *in extenso*. The union with this incomparable person did not last beyond a twelve-month, and the latter part of the time the attachment seems to have become a purely Platonic affair; but it sufficed to inspire M. Comte with the most intense and concentrated spirit of egotistical bombast and nonsense with which mortal man was ever endowed.

'While Madame Clotilde de Vaux lived, I had felt her angelic influence for one year only. She has now for more than six years since her death been associated with all my thoughts, and with all my feelings. Through her I have at length become for humanity, in the strictest sense, a twofold organ, as may any one who has reaped the full advantages of woman's influence. My career had been that of Aristotle—I should have wanted energy for that of St. Paul, but for her. I had extracted sound philosophy from real science; I was enabled by her to found on the basis of that philosophy the universal religion. . . . Four years ago, I revealed the source of my inspiration, one beyond all compare, by the publication of my *Discourse on the System of Positivism*. At that time Madame de Vaux could only

be judged by the intellectual and moral results of her inspiration which that work brought home to all sympathetic hearts, as to all synthetic minds. . . .

'Such a catechumen meets perfectly all the conditions of the dialogue. Superior as she was, Madame Clotilde de Vaux was yet so early taken from me as to render it impossible sufficiently to initiate her in Positivism, naturally the object of all her wishes and efforts. Even before death broke off finally the work of affectionate instruction, pain and grief had been very serious impediments. I was hardly able to sketch out to her whilst alive the systematic preparation which I now accomplish with her when dead. My angelic disciple then brings with her nothing beyond the dispositions essential to a disciple; dispositions to be found in most women, and even in many proletaries.

'I have already explained in my *Positive Politics* the general idea of the institution of real guardian angels. Those who are familiar with that explanation are aware that the principal type among women becomes habitually inseparable from the two others. This sweet connexion holds good even in our exceptional case. For my pure and immortal companion unites in her own person the subjective mother my second life presupposes, and the objective daughter who was destined for a time to add her grace to my existence. . . . It is thus perfectly natural for me to use in this Catechism the terms of father and daughter, the habitual language of religious instruction. . . .

'These names, then, father and daughter, become peculiarly appropriate to the teacher and catechumen, and they are in conformity with the old etymology of the term priest. By using them I place myself naturally in the relation in which I should have stood to Madame de Vaux, had it not been for our fatal catastrophe.

'Whilst, however, this concentration is necessary—and it is only the presiding angel that takes part directly in the holy conversation—it ought not to escape either the reader or myself that my two other patronesses take an appropriate though silent part in it. Elsewhere I have spoken of the subjective influence of my venerable mother, of the objective action of my noble adopted daughter. In the present work they will always be present to my heart, when my intellect shall be duly feeling the impulse of the principal angel.

'These three angels are for the future inseparable, and inseparably connected with me; so much so, that their constant co-operation has lately suggested to the eminent artist whom Positivism now claims an idea of admirable beauty, by which a mere portrait becomes a picture of profound meaning. . . . The very period of the year in which I am writing this, to me, pleasant work of elaboration, recalls with peculiar force the wishes she herself expressed, during that incomparable year, for a methodical initiation. All I have to do, then, is to carry myself back seven years. I can then conceive as actually spoken to a living object that which I must now develope subjectively, by placing myself in 1852 in the situation of 1845. To carry myself back in this way requires an effort; but the effort is compensated by

the great advantage of being able to give a better idea of her angelic ascendancy over me. . . .

'I am late in bringing to its completion the initiation which my affection had led me to begin. But, on the other hand, I bring it more easily into conformity with the sentiments which finally prevailed towards her who will always be associated with me as at once my disciple and colleague. . . . Her age has become fixed by the general law of our subjective existence. My own, relatively to hers, increases daily, so as to sanction no other images but those drawn from the filial relation. The existence of both of us is thus brought into a more perfect continuity, and the harmony of my whole nature is also carried to a higher perfection. At the same time, then, that I thus explain the unity of man as constituted by Positivism, I am developing and consolidating the fundamental connexion between my private and my public life. The philosophical influence of the angel who inspires me becomes from this point of view as complete and as direct as it ever can be; consequently none any longer contest it. . . . This expression of grateful feeling by the public must, as well as my own, embrace the two other guardian angels who form the complement of the presiding one. . . . In undertaking this work which is an episode in my larger one, I have, then, the special assistance of all my three guardian angels. It is true one only actively participates—the other two co-operate silently; but this in no way diminishes the claim of those two to the veneration of all my followers.'—pp. 19—25.

Two other 'angels' M. Comte also acknowledges the influence of; one is his mother, whom rumour says he did not treat over well when alive, but whom he now repays by worshipping when dead, or become 'subjectively immortal,' to use M. Comte's philosophical jargon; and the other, his adopted daughter; and he prays that all these 'angels' may share in the grateful worship of a Positivist public; and no doubt they will when once such a public has been found.

We cannot wonder that in this soft and tender mood M. Comte makes his chief appeal to *women*. We suspect, however, that there is not a little cajolery in the matter; for he frankly acknowledges that, unless women can be got to work in his behalf, the religion of Positivism can never be established. We fancy the reader will say—'Then it has no chance; for you might more easily persuade women to become feticlists than atheists.' We quite think so; and therefore also think, if there were no other reason against M. Comte's success (though it is but one of a million) that 'Positive religion' will always remain a nullity. But M. Comte thinks otherwise, and fully believes that women will be among the most ardent of his apostles, and the most indefatigable of his pioneers. Certainly it will not be for want of flattery if they should not.

That he may not scare them too much by atheism he has endeavoured to enlist their 'affective' nature by providing them with a spick-and-span new God; and, generally, has accommodated himself to their infirmities by copying, in a rather servile manner (though of course with ludicrous results), the observances and ritual of other religions,—especially Catholicism, which he grotesquely mimics. To other religious systems his own bears much the same resemblance as an ape to a man.

We can easily imagine the consternation with which the disciples of that *quondam* M. Comte who once ignored religion and all its 'affections,' some few of whom, if we are rightly informed, gloried in chastising rebellious nature, and in affecting perfect stoicism in the majestic presence of inviolable Necessity and Law, have found M. Comte himself all at once assuming the airs and state of a Positivist Pope, and claiming the homage of all mankind. Let us hear the announcement of this new gospel, which, omitting 'glory to God in the highest,' is nevertheless to insure 'peace on earth, and good will to men!'

"In the name of the past and of the future, the servants of humanity—both its philosophical and practical servants—come forward to claim as their due the general direction of this world. Their object is, to constitute at length a real providence in all departments—moral, intellectual, and material. Consequently, they exclude once for all from political supremacy, all the different servants of God—Catholic, Protestant, or Deist, as being at once behindhand and a cause of disturbance.' With this uncompromising announcement, on Sunday, October the 19th, 1851, in the Palais Cardinal, after a summary of five hours, I ended my third course of philosophical lectures on the general history of humanity. Since that memorable conclusion the second volume of my *System of Positive Politics* has lately given a direct proof how entirely a social destination, such as that above indicated, is the appropriate distinction of Positive Philosophy, for it has shown itself able to suggest the most systematic theory of moral and social order.'—Preface, p. i.

This vainglorious style is not exceptional; it is M. Comte's wont: *I—I—I*—you hear the first personal pronoun going for ever. To use his jargon—we do not see in his own case any of the predicted effects of his system—namely, of repressing the 'egoistic,' and developing the 'altruistic' tendencies of human nature.

But we must now allow M. Comte and his incomparable 'angel' to set forth in their own words the chief doctrines of the Positive Religion. The problem is—Given atheism and annihilation, to construct a religion and immortality; see how easily M. Comte can solve it.



And first, to introduce the reader into the presence of, the *Grand Être*.—You need not take off your shoes, gentle reader, for it is *not* holy ground; nay, this being is, in part yourself—it is the Collective Humanity, dead, alive, and unborn. After drolly remarking that the ‘imaginary’ gods that religion had hitherto ‘provisionally introduced,’ had some power of stirring affections in man, M. Comte intimates that his *new* god, when fully recognised, will have incomparably more. But to manifest him has been a great difficulty; and, as we have seen, he might, if M. Comte had never met with Madame de Vaux, have remained unmanifested for nobody knows how long. It was a slow evolution; in fact, the *Grand Être* waited to be created till the ‘immense scientific preparation required as an introduction to Positivism’ had been completed. Listen.

“Whilst the philosophical initiation only comprehended the order of the material world—nay, even when it had extended to the order of living beings, it could only reveal laws which were indispensable for our action, it could not furnish us with any direct object for an enduring and constant affection. This is no longer the case since the completion of our gradual preparation by the introduction of the special study of the order of man’s existence, whether as an individual or as society.

‘This is the last step in the process. We are now able to condense the whole of our positive conceptions in the one single idea of an immense and eternal Being, Humanity, destined by sociological laws to constant development under the preponderating influence of biological and cosmological necessities. This, the real great Being, on whom all, whether individuals or societies, depend as the prime mover of their existence, becomes the centre of our affections. They rest in it by as spontaneous an impulse as do our thoughts and our actions. This Being, by its very idea, suggests at once the sacred formula of Positivism—*Love as our principle; Order as our basis; and Progress as our end.* Its compound existence is ever founded on the free concurrence of independent wills.’—p. 63.

The reader will doubtless be surprised to learn that the premises lead to any such conclusion—the very *idea* of such a being to any such *formula*; but M. Comte—who is in very truth, as Socrates has it, a ‘sack of words’—often uses language without the smallest glimmer of meaning. Let us hear a little more:—

‘The struggle of humanity against the combined influences of the necessities it is obliged to obey, growing as it does in energy and success, offers the heart no less than the intellect a better object of contemplation than the capricious omnipotence of its theological precursor, capricious by the very force of the term omnipotence. Such a supreme being is more within the reach of our feelings as well as of our

conceptions, for it is identical in nature with its servants, at the same time that it is superior to them. As such it more powerfully excites them to an activity, the aim of which is its preservation and amelioration.

'*The Woman*.—Still, my father, the physical labour necessitated by our bodily wants, seems to me directly in opposition with this tendency to affection which you claim for Positive religion. Surely such activity can never be free from a character of egoism, extending even to the scientific efforts it induces us to make. Now this alone would be enough to prevent the actual predominance of love as an all-pervading influence.'—pp. 64, 65.

The 'woman,' thus puzzled (as she well may be) to know how 'affection' can be called forth to this shadowy 'great being,' receives solution of her doubts in the following answer from the priest of humanity, although he seems to us only further to obfuscate matters:—

'As man's action on matter becomes more and more collective, it tends more and more to assume an altruistic character, though the impulse of egoism must ever be indispensable to set it in motion. For as each habitually labours for others, he develops by such a conduct of his life the sympathies of others, granting that such conduct meets with sufficient appreciation. The toilsome servants of humanity stand in need of nothing but a complete and familiar consciousness of the true nature of their life.'—p. 65.

The 'woman,' with commendable docility, here declares that she 'begins to master the general harmony of Positivism:—

'The more you study,' says the priest of humanity, 'the Positive synthesis, the more you will feel, my daughter, how by virtue of its reality it is more complete and efficacious than any other. The habitual predominance of altruism over egoism, to secure which is the great problem for man, is in Positivism the direct result of the constant harmony between our best inclinations and all our labours, theoretical as well as practical . . . You now find no difficulty in conceiving this striking contrast between two systems, the one of which admits, while the other denies, the existence in our nature of disinterested affection.'—p. 66.

The simple 'woman,' however, is not yet fully indoctrinated in the mystery of the strange god she is to worship: and, in conversation second seeks some further *eclaircissements*. In reply to a good deal of what is called 'soft soap,' applied to woman's gentle nature, &c., which particularly qualifies them, &c., for being patrons and propagandists of the true 'altruistic' doctrines of Positivism, the 'woman' says in her own dull way:—

'I feel encouraged by this introduction, my father, and I would ask you now to enter on a systematic exposition of Positive doctrine.

Would you begin by explaining more directly and fully that one doctrine on which it all rests? I already understand that the Great Being, in your conception, is, by its very nature, the expression of the whole order of things—not merely of the order of man, but of the external world. As this is the case, I feel to want a clearer and more precise definition as regards this Being, the fundamental idea which gives unity to Positivism.’—p. 74.

To this the priest makes the somewhat novel and startling, but discriminating observation, that though *whole* humanity,—the whole of human beings,—constitutes the *Grand Etre*, yet that *all* men do not form parts of him, (*her*, or *it*, whichever be the gender,) a good many men being far too worthless for any such purpose; but—

‘the ‘whole’ takes in those only who are ‘really capable of assimilation, in virtue of a real co-operation, on their part, in furthering the common good.’ ‘All are necessarily born children of humanity, but ‘all do not become her servants. Many remain in the parasitic state, which, excusable during their education, becomes blameable when their education is complete. Times of anarchy bring forth in swarms such creatures—nay, even enable them to flourish—though they are, in sad truth, but BURDENS ON THE TRUE GREAT BEING’ (!)—p. 74.

But never mind: though all this seems greatly to detract from the fair rotundity and comeliness of the ‘Great Being,’ M. Comte easily remedies it; if there are millions of men who are not worthy of the honour, millions of the lower species are sufficiently serviceable to man to entitle them to it; so you may throw in horses, dogs, camels, asses, cats, and leeches, to fill up the void—the *hiatus valde deplendus*—which the reprobates of humanity were unworthy to fill. Truly it does not much matter: for

‘Mere digesting machines,’ says M. Comte, ‘are no real part of humanity. You may reject them, and to make up for the loss, associate with the new supreme Being all the animals who lend a noble aid. Wherever we find habitual co-operation in forwarding the destinies of man, and that co-operation given voluntarily, there the being which gives it becomes a real element of this compound existence; and the degree of importance it attains is proportioned to the dignity of the species to which it belongs, and to its own individual value. To form a right estimate of this indispensable complement of human existence, let us imagine ourselves without it. We should then be led, without hesitation, to look on many horses, dogs, oxen, &c., as more estimable than certain men.’—pp. 75, 76.

And so what can be more reasonable than that they should form part of the Great Being?

‘Such,’ he goes on to say, ‘is our primary conception of the com-

bined system of human action. In it, naturally, our attention is directed on solidarity, rather than on continuity. This last idea must, however, in the end, be the predominant one, though at first it attracts less notice, as it requires a deeper examination to discover it; for in a very short time the progress of society comes to depend more on the idea of time than on that of space.'—p. 76.

What may be the connexion here we cannot pretend to say. M. Comte often, as already said, uses words without one ray of sense, so that it is impossible to tell what he means; that is, charitably supposing that he means anything.

Such is the 'Great Being' which M. Comte has manufactured for the behoof of the *little beings* that make him up, and whom our sage had deprived of every other kind of deity; and surely it is worthy of the manufacturer. The 'woman' falls down awestruck before this *jee-faw-fum*, and says:—

'I feel compelled, my father, to admit this fundamental conception, though it is by no means as yet clear of difficulty; but when I look on such an existence, the sense of my own nothingness alarms me. Before its immensity I seem to be reduced to nothing more completely than I was before the majesty of a God with whom, feeble as I am, I felt myself in some definite and direct relation. Now that you have completely mastered me by the ever-growing preponderance of the new Supreme Being, I feel the need of your re-awakening in me a just consciousness of my individual existence.'—p. 79.

But, to M. Comte's honour be it said, he is, in this case, effectually near with his consolations; and his hartshorn and burnt feathers happily suffice to sustain this delicate lady fainting in the presence of this shadowy abstraction;—more shadowy than was ever distilled from the subtlest logical alembic of the schoolmen. He says, and says truly enough:—

'We must never forget—and this is sufficient to meet your wishes—that the Great Being cannot act except through individual agents. This is the reason why the objective part of the race, though brought more and more into subordination to the subjective, must always be indispensable to the subjective for it to exert any influence . . . . Each of these individuals, if worthy of his position, can assert himself in presence of the new Supreme Being, more than he could before its predecessor.'—p. 80.

No doubt of *that*.—Further on, M. Comte tells us that the most invaluable parts of the Great Being are those that are non-existent, and contradicting Solomon's adage, decides that a dead ass is better than a living lion:—

.' In the composition of our Great Being, the dead occupy the first

place, then those who are yet to be born. The two together are far more numerous than the living, most of whom too are only its servants, without the power, at present, of becoming its organs.—p. 89.

Nevertheless, the 'angelic' novice finds great difficulty in conceiving 'how it will be possible to institute, still more how it will be possible to secure, in universal practice, the daily realization of subjective life,'—that is, living with reference to this partly dead and partly not-yet-alive GREAT BEING,—the figment of Positive Worship. But M. Comte reassures her thus:—

'*The Priest*.—On the contrary, my daughter, I hope soon to set you free from your uneasiness on this point, natural though it be; and I rely on a judicious survey of the Past—the long initiation of our race, now finally ended, as is clearly shown by the very fact of my drawing up this Catechism' (!)—p. 91.

That fact is of course conclusive: and so, after a rignarole about the 'subjective life,' in harmony with such a preface, the good lady (who is more easily satisfied than any other two-legged creature we ever met with) finds that 'that explanation has set her quite at ease.'

But the reader, having the object of worship thus provided for him, will be anxious to know what are the prospects held out which are to take the place of the 'hope of immortality.' Nothing more easy:—though annihilation awaits him as a personal consciousness, yet he has before him the prospect of a 'subjective' immortality, that is, in plain English, of being a *part* of the dead parts of the 'Great Being;' and if he behaves himself as a good Positivist in his 'objective life,' that is, while he is alive, it may be that seven years after his death he may receive a sort of apotheosis. Here it is, as described by M. Comte; and who but must be dazzled by the prospect, and feel that to realize it the loss of heaven would be a cheap bargain?

'Seven years after death, when the passions that disturb the judgment are hushed, and yet the best sources of information remain accessible, a solemn judgment, an idea which, in its germ, sociocracy borrows from theocracy, finally decides the lot of each. If the priesthood pronounces for *incorporation*, it presides over the transfer, with due pomp, of the sanctified remains. They had previously been deposited in the burial-place of the city; they now take their place forever in the sacred wood that surrounds the temple of humanity.'—pp. 135, 136.

The hopes of subjective incorporation thus inspired will, of course, be far more potent than the old-fashioned hopes of a future life; and M. Comte does not fail also to trumpet forth their great superiority as being so absolutely *unselfish*. That they are

not 'egoistic' is certain; whether they will ever be 'altruistic,' or anything else, is quite another question.

At the same time the 'woman' declaims against the 'subjective paradise' being shut against her sex, as no provision has been made for her participation in the last of the 'eight sacraments'—the 'final consecration!' The loss of nothing, one would think, should not perturb her so strongly. M. Comte hastens to reassure her:—

'The most important duty of woman is to form and perfect man. It would be then as absurd, as it would be unjust, to honour a good citizen, and neglect to honour the mother, the wife, to whom his success was mainly due. Around, and at times within, each consecrated tomb, the priesthood will be bound to collect, in the name of humanity, all the individuals who helped its inmate, while alive, to perform the services she rewards. Your sex, by its superior organization, can taste more keenly the pure enjoyment which results from the mere growth and exercise of good feelings; but it should not, therefore, renounce its claim to just praise—much less should it renounce the subjective immortality whose value it so thoroughly appreciates.'—p. 137.

But the reader will perhaps infer that there can be no scope for 'prayer' in this fantastical system of worship. He is much mistaken; there is plenty of it, public and private; and the times, and modes, and gestures, and attitudes, and proportions of 'commemoration' or 'effusion,' are set forth with all the minuteness of a *petit maitre* or master of ceremonies of the old school—for which function, or one like it, many parts of this volume would seem to show that M. Comte was incomparably well fitted. Prayer is to be three times a day; 'commemoration' is to be twice as long as 'effusion.' 'The morning prayer should be in 'general twice as long as the evening. That at mid-day should 'be half as long.' 'Each man should begin his day by a due 'invocation' of his angels.' The last prayer is to be conveniently said in bed.

No end of æsthetic attractions and ornamentations, of auxiliary influences from all the fine arts, are to add to the effects of the Positivist's prayers, when (as, of course, soon *will* be the case) Positivism has assumed its proper place in the world.

'In prayer, nothing can free us from the obligation of constantly forming our prayers ourselves; so that every Positivist must be in some respects, as it were, a poet—at least, for his own private worship. We must use fixed forms of prayer in order to secure mere regularity; but these forms must originally, in all cases, be drawn up by him who uses them, or he will find that they have no great efficiency. However, though the form remains the same, the prayer

admits of some degree of variety, as it is the artificial signs only that are fixed. Their uniformity only brings into a stronger light the spontaneous variations of natural language. Such language, whether musical or mimic, is always more æsthetical than the other.

'This poetical faculty of originating our prayers will be largely developed when the regeneration of education shall have sufficiently trained all Positivists in the views it requires, and even in such compositions. This I will point out to you in the Third Part of this Catechism. When we have reached that point, the general art will always derive suitable assistance from the special arts. All will then be familiar with singing, which is essentially the basis of music. All will be familiar also with drawing, the general source of the three arts of form—painting, sculpture, and architecture. Lastly, when we draw out our form of worship, we may generally introduce special ornaments, chosen with judgment from the accumulated stores of human art—the æsthetic treasures of humanity.'—Pp. 110, 111.

We cannot but lament that M. Comte has not given us a few specimens of devotional compositions with some of 'his special ornaments.' We should have liked at all events a form or two of invocation by way of setting us a-going. We imagine, however, that the devout Positivist could not begin better than to start off with the form—'O thou great dead-alive Being!'

But in order to assist the barren imagination of the worshippers of the *Grand Être*, 'personal worship,' M. Comte says, 'is to consist in the daily adoration of the best types which we can find to personify humanity, taking into account the whole of our private relations.' Now, the 'affective sex,' as M. Comte coaxingly says, 'is naturally the most perfect representation of humanity, and, at the same time, her 'principal minister;' so that 'in the normal state each man will find in his family circle real guardian angels, at once the ministers and representatives of humanity.' The 'woman' does not exactly see why she might not with equal reason 'choose any one of the leading relations of life;' and truly we do not see either. But the priest settles her doubt—though not ours—in the following perspicuous manner:—

'We must really, my daughter, duly combine three of them, if we wish the worship of angels to have its full effect. We find in the theory of Positivism an indication of the necessity of this plurality. For we there find that the sympathetic instincts are three in number, and each of the three finds a special female influence to correspond with it. The mother, the wife, the daughter, must in our worship, as in the existence of which that worship is the ideal expression, develop in us respectively—the mother, veneration; the wife, attachment; the daughter, kindness. As for the sister, the influence she exercises has hardly a very distinct character, and she may, in succession, be con-

\* needed with each of the three essential types. The three together represent to us the three natural modes of human continuity—the past, the present, the future—as also the three degrees of solidarity which bind us to our superiors, our equals, and our inferiors. But the spontaneous harmony of the three can only be fully maintained by observing their natural subordination. So the maternal angel must habitually take the first place, yet so that her gentle presidency never impair the force of the other two.’—p. 121.

We cannot help pitying the *sister*—poor creature. However, M. Comte will have it so; and the sooner she turns herself into one of the more significant ‘types’ the better.

One of these ‘types,’ as M. Comte says, will usually have become ‘subjective’—while another remains ‘objective’;—that is, to use plain English, mothers in general will die before our wives and daughters; and M. Comte congratulates himself ‘that the two influences, ‘subjective’ and ‘objective,’ will be normally mixed, and our homage more efficacious for the ‘mixture.’

The woman still seems unsatisfied that her sex should yield all the ‘types’—but at last the ‘priest’ thus effectually consoles her:—

‘You have, my daughter, an easy solution of your difficulty in the plurality of our angelic types. This is the proper way of meeting it, otherwise it would be impossible to overcome it. In fact, the principal angel alone must be common to both sexes. Each sex must borrow from the other the two angels that complete the institution. For the mother has, for both sexes equally, a preponderance, not merely as the main source even of our physical existence, but still more as normally presiding over the whole of our education. The mother, then, is the object of adoration to both sexes. To her, your sex must add the worship of the husband and the son, on the same grounds as I have assigned above for the man’s worship of the wife and daughter.’—p. 122.

After which the ‘woman’ gives in her adhesion to so sensible a distribution of ‘types,’ and declares that she ‘feels already the strong attraction of this great institution.’

But whatever concessions M. Comte may make in the matter of ‘types,’ he decrees that, in the temples which of course will soon be rising in every part of the earth, the ‘image’ which is to represent the ‘Great Being’ is to be a ‘feminine one;’ that, M. Comte insists upon as absolutely necessary; and *She* and all that appertains to her is thus minutely described:—

‘*The Priest.*—The nature of our Supreme Being really leaves, my daughter, no opening even now for hesitation as to the plastic representation of her. In painting, or in sculpture equally, the symbol of



our divinity will always be a woman of the age of thirty, with her son in her arms . . . Groups with more figures might render the symbolic representation more complete, but in such groups it would lose too much of its synthetic character to come into daily use. Of the two modes which are adapted for the expression of this normal symbol, sculpture is suitable for the image fixed in each temple, in the midst of the women chosen as above mentioned, and behind the sacred desk. But painting is preferable for the moveable banners to be carried before us in our solemn processions. On their white side will be the holy image; on their green, the sacred formula of Positivism. This green side will be turned towards the procession.'—p. 112.

Said we not right that M. Comte deserved to be a master of ceremonies?

But as Catholicism has the sign of the cross, so Positivism is to have its sign too, 'which in ordinary use may represent the characteristic formula of Positivism. It is derived,' M. Comte tells us, from his cerebral theory, and consists in 'a continuous movement of the hand over the three chief organs.' 'So without any arbitrary institution,' sagely remarks M. Comte, 'Positivism is already in possession of a sign for common use' (if there were but blockheads to use it), 'more expressive than any of those adopted by Catholicism and Islamism.' Momentous result!

As to the 'temples,' hear him:—

'*The Priest*.—We cannot, at present, my daughter, form an adequate conception of the temples of Positivism. Architecture is the most technical, and the least æsthetic of all the fine arts, so that each fresh synthesis finds its architectural expression more difficult than any other. Our religion must be not only thoroughly worked out, but also widely spread, before the public wants can show what shape the edifices required must take. *Provisionally, then, we shall have to use the old churches, in proportion as they fall into disuse.*'—p. 140.

The 'old churches' will doubtless be a great convenience when once M. Comte has emptied them; but, for our own part, we should imagine they would be found too large and cold to be comfortable for his scant flocks. The smallest vestry in any of them would be quite sufficient to hold all the Positivist worshippers in the largest county of England for many centuries to come. But M. Comte is 'positive' as to the 'situation' and 'directions' of the buildings:—

'Humanity is, in the main, composed of such dead as are worthy of a future life, so that her temples must be in the centre of the tombs of the elect. On the other hand, the chief attribute of Positive religion is its necessary universality (!) Everywhere, then, in all parts of the earth, the temples of humanity must turn towards the general metro-

polis. *This, for a long time, as the result of past history, must be Paris.*—p. 141.

M. Comte thinks nothing beneath his universally 'regenerating' genius; and he has, therefore, condescended to reform the calendar, and tricked the years out in a most incongruous frippery of nomenclature, borrowed from all times and nations. Moses, Homer, St. Paul, Cæsar, and Bichat, give the names to some of the months, and all the rest, and everything else about the Positivist calendar, exhibit equal congruity. However, M. Comte, as usual, attaches great and mysterious importance to the most trivial innovations; with him they are fraught with benedict results to humanity. The year is to consist of thirteen months, of four weeks each, with one complementary day set apart as the 'festival of the dead,' while the complementary day of leap-year is, similarly devoted to all 'holy women.' M. Comte *had* designed, he tells us, to new name all the days of the week, but he gave up the attempt, and there will 'be no trace of it except a beautiful series of prayers, by M. Joseph Lonchaupt, for each day.' He consoles himself with the thought that the 'old names will have 'the 'advantage' of recalling the for ever vanished 'stages' of 'fetichism, polytheism, and monotheism!' But other not less momentous changes of form he *has* effected; as thus:—

'To make our worship completely regular, it was necessary, my daughter, that each day of any week whatever should always hold the same place in the year. This invariability is obtained by affixing no weekly name, first, to the complementary day which always closes the Positivist year, then to the additional day which follows it, if it is leap-year, according to the practice of Western Europe. Each of these exceptional days is really sufficiently marked by the festival appointed for it. With this precaution our calendar holds good for all years—a point as important for the *régime* as for the worship.'—p. 149.

We cannot give the whole of M. Comte's amended calendar. Suffice it to say, that his year *ONE* is 1788; and that he dates his Table A. (System of Sociolatriy) 'Saturday, 7th month Archimedes, 66; which, translated into *our* calendar, is April 1st, 1851; and surely it was a very appropriate date.

But our space is nearly exhausted, and we must content ourselves with just hinting to the reader some chief remaining peculiarities of M. Comte's eminently original, but *pre*-eminently silly scheme.

'Widowhood' is to be perpetual; this is an essential feature of Positivist sociolatriy; for as the lost spouse is only *annihilated*, but is not properly *dead*, being in a 'subjective' state, 'subjective polygamy' would be the result of successive

marriages! Happily for M. Comte, his 'angel' concedes with her wonted docility this ticklish point; but whether she would have done so, had not M. Comte spoken for her, is somewhat doubtful. We fear this Hindooish trait will prove one of the stumbling-blocks in the way of the reception of the 'Positivist system,' on the part of the 'affective sex,' and 'chief ministers of humanity.'

But we must not let the reader be ignorant of the rapidity with which the Positivist regeneration of all things is to take effect, lest peradventure it find him unprepared. The sum of the whole then is, that very shortly, even within a century or so, the entire West will be 'regenerated.' The great states will all be broken up, each into many, each 'with a population of two or three millions, at the average rate of one hundred per square mile.' This being the maximum of M. Comte's optimist states, they are to be of about the same extent as 'Tuscany, Belgium, and Holland, at the present time:—

'Before the end of the nineteenth century the French Republic will, of its own free will, break up into seventeen independent republics, each comprising five of the existing departments. Ireland will, ere long, separate from England. This will lead to the rupture of the artificial bonds which now unite Scotland and even Wales, with England proper.'—p. 338.

So that at the opening of the next century, we are assured. 'Portugal and Ireland, granting them to remain entire, will be the largest republics of the West!' M. Comte's 'patriciate' is to consist (excluding his priesthood) of agriculturists, manufacturers, merchants, bankers; and he even now settles the respective numbers of them—2000 of the last; 100,000 of the third; 200,000 of the second; and 100,000 of the first, will be sufficient 'to provide industrial chiefs for the 120 millions' of devout Positivists who will be worshipping the *Grand Etre* 'in the regenerated West,' and who will make up his 'proletariate,' or, in unambitious English, 'labouring classes.' After making these and similar astounding prophecies, which shows that M. Comte must have 'prevision' with a vengeance, the docile 'woman' observes—'Your language, my father, seems to me never to depart 'from a sound estimate of human existence in its manifold 'forms'!!!

'The sixty republics of the regenerated West, will, in the normal state, have no other habitual union but their common 'education, the community of names, and customs, and common 'festivals; in a word, their union will be *religious* (!) not political.' Meantime, they are to have a centre of unity, in imita-

tion of the Papacy. It is the High Priest of Humanity, 'who,' M. Comte assures us, 'will be more than any mediæval Pope, the only real head of the western world.' For a considerable time Paris will of course be the centre of this confederacy of Positivist States—the Rome, in short, of Positivism; but after awhile, by the efforts of a noble proselytism—especially prosecuted by the Czars of Russia (!)—the Positivist religion will transcend the West, and even penetrate the African populations; happily cutting short the theological and metaphysical stages of development, and handing over these thrice-happy converts at once from Fetichism to Positivism. We presume that the metropolis of Positivism, wherein resides the High Priest of Humanity, will then be shifted a little, and made more central for his Holiness's convenience. M. Comte, whose genius nothing escapes, has condescended to fix even the salaries of his various orders of priests. Every aspirant is to have 120*l.* per annum; every full 'priest' 480*l.*; the High Priest of Humanity to have 2400*l.* precisely. We must add that in carrying out his system, which, if practicable, would be a sort of alliance of priestcraft and despotism, M. Comte enounces some maxims of political economy which would make Adam Smith turn in his grave if he could listen to them.

The eminent *topsy-turviness* of M. Comte's mind (if we may use the irreverent expression) is manifested by his interweaving into it the tatters of all sorts of contradictory paradoxes that come in his way. Though an atheist to all real intents, he admires Catholicism exceedingly, and has mimicked it zealously; though a profound lover of enlightenment, he hates all Protestantism and Deism, nay, Atheism and Pantheism too—though his *Grand Être* is the very image and consummation of Atheism itself; he abhors Rousseau and Voltaire as 'destructives,' but he glories in Diderot and Hume as valuable allies; he admires, of all rulers, the late Czar of Russia—indeed, he has a tolerance for all sorts of despots, and therefore looks rather kindly on the dictatorship of Louis Napoleon; while his bile is always stirred at any of the forms of what the world calls constitutionalism. He hates with a profound hatred all theologians, and lawyers, and metaphysicians, who he declares can but obstruct the progress of the truth, and seems to think that even fetichists will go into his new kingdom of heaven before them. The apostle of a new light, he puts his chief reliance on women and artisans, whose very ignorance will be free from prejudice, and better enable them to comprehend his doctrine. At all events, we imagine it will form no obstacle. This 'Catechism' will be about equally comprehended

by knowledge and ignorance, and, if received at all, it must be received by a profound and unreasoning faith.

M. Comte has been compared to Bacon and Descartes,—to the profoundest thinkers and greatest reformers of science. We have not the smallest doubt that the rhapsodical eulogies which a few disciples have indulged in will soon be felt to have been most ludicrously misplaced. M. Comte's enormous assumptions, and the manner in which he travesties all history to make them seem plausible, will go far to determine his true place in philosophy; it will also be seen, on a due estimate, how little there is in what he has written to justify the supposition that he has himself enlarged, or has given man a 'method' by which his successors may enlarge the domain of science. We find, indeed, an eternal iteration of certain positions in different forms; but supposing them ever so true, (and while some are true, not to say truistical, others are as utterly false,) we see not how they can give us a new method. A thousand times we hear that M. Comte has 'inaugurated the true hierarchy of the sciences,'—that he has 'co-ordinated physical and moral science,'—that he has constituted the 'real scientific system'—the 'encyclopædic series' of the sciences,—that he has laid the foundation of the 'real encyclopædic culture and development' of the sciences; that he has taught us that in the development both of society and the individual there are of necessity three stages—the 'theological,' 'metaphysical,' and 'positive';—that scientific discovery must proceed from the more simple and general to the more complex special phenomena;—that the phenomena of 'biology and sociology' are more complicated than those of chemistry, and those of chemistry than mechanics,' &c. &c. &c., all which we are told over and over again in an immensity of cloudy verbiage; yet granting for the sake of argument that it is all true, what new powers that the Baconian did not previously possess, does it give us? What instrument or *method*, different from and superior to that by which science was before prosecuted, does it present us with? To us, we confess, this iteration is, as Burke says, 'much going in a scanty space; a postilion's travels—miles enough to circle the globe in one short stage';—an everlasting repetition of half a dozen barren formulae. If it be said that the great benefit of the Positive philosophy is that it will induce man to have done with seeking or speculating about 'causes,' and to confine himself solely to 'phenomena,' it may be well questioned whether any philosophy will ever do *that*; if it be said that it will have this effect so far as to prevent the prejudices and preconceptions of the 'theological stage' from summarily dealing with the problems of science, the answer is, that that lesson had

been pretty well learned, without abolishing theology altogether, long before Comte was born; learned by thousands who had done far more for science than he ever did, and without surrendering 'theology' at all. Comte's promises of the progress of science in all directions, in virtue of the prosecution of his 'method,' are, we know, magnificent; but we cannot see that the inductive philosophy was not, and is not, in secure possession of everything that is really conducive to the progress of discovery, independently of M. Comte's voluminous expositions. His promises are magnificent; but if they be verified, we cannot see that it will be in virtue of any new *organum* which M. Comte has put into men's hands. Magnificent, however, as are occasionally M. Comte's promises, we must say in justice to him he is hardly so bold as some of his followers in this country. Little as we expect that men will gain that measure of 'prevision' which even he ventures to promise us, he yet shrinks from the more audacious hopes which he seems to have inspired in some on this side the Channel, who are for exercising a 'prevision' which is to make them masters of destiny, and convert science, as a great secularist says, into the 'providence of man.' In this very book, though M. Comte expresses himself boldly enough of the progress of humanity, yet he expressly admits that as we proceed to biology and sociology, and generally to the sciences which have to deal with special phenomena, those phenomena become so complicated that we can never hope to calculate them in any given case so as to have 'prevision.' Empirical rule is all that he encourages us to hope for; meteorology and geology he does not allow to be sciences at all.

Let us hear him; for at this crisis in the history of speculation in our own country it is not without instruction to find even the great manufacturer of the *Grand Etre* confessing that he calls us to worship a Deity who, like each one of us, does not know, in the spheres which most concern happiness, in the phenomena of biology, sociology, meteorology, 'what a day or an hour shall bring forth;' so complicated are the conditions of events submitted to our calculus, so infinite the variables that enter them, so circuitously and remotely may they tend to produce one another, and so dependent may be the least on the greatest, and the greatest on the least.

'The various branches into which the study of the world or of man is, for practical need, divided, reveal to us an increasing number of different laws. These laws will never be susceptible of reduction, the one under the other, spite of the frivolous hopes inspired at first by our discovery of the law of planetary gravitation. These laws are for the most part, still unknown; many must ever remain so.'—p. 161.

In conclusion, we would observe that if the 'previsions' of science which M. Comte promises us be of the same quality with his own 'previsions' of the 'speedy triumphs of the Positive Religion, they will not be worth much to the world. At the same time, we frankly concede that in indulging them M. Comte has proceeded in the very spirit of his own method, and has completely ignored all—'Causes!'

ART. VI.—(1.) *The History of Herodotus. A new English Version. Edited with copious Notes and Appendices, illustrating the History and Geography of Herodotus, from the most recent sources of information; and embodying the chief results, Historical and Ethnographical, which have been obtained in the progress of Cuneiform and Hieroglyphical Discovery.* By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A., late Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford, assisted by Colonel Sir H. RAWLINSON, K.C.B., and Sir J. G. WILKINSON, F.R.S. Vols I. and II. London: Murray. 1858.

(2.) *Herodotus; with a Commentary,* by JOSEPH WILLIAMS BLAKESLEY, B.D., late Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. Two Vols. London: Whittaker and Co. 1854.

THERE is, perhaps, no other Greek author who wins a larger measure of our sympathy than Herodotus. This is no doubt partly to be accounted for by the nature of the work he has undertaken, and which, in an age ignorant of 'style,' allowed him to write as he would have talked, freely and colloquially. The author of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* has little room to exhibit himself: his canvas is too full of gods and of heroes. And the great dramatic poets of Greece, as they stalk by in mask, pall, and colthurnus, give us but few glimpses of their every-day selves beneath the festival attire.

But still less approachable is the writer whose name is oftenest linked with that of Herodotus, as for some time his contemporary, and who takes up the thread of Grecian story where it was dropped by his immediate predecessor. Few compositions are so severe as the great work of Thucydides. According to a pleasant story in Lucian, which, we are inclined to think with Mr. Rawlinson, may have a basis of fact, Thucydides, when a lad, had been moved to tears at some 'reading' of the elder historian. There is little to suggest the invention of such a story in what he has himself produced. Thucydides wrote for the benefit of statesmen and students of the 'philosophy of history,' and speaks slightlyly

of some 'chroniclers, who were more anxious to amuse their readers than to adhere to the truth:' not without a reference to Herodotus, probably. He had at least learned more command of his feelings when he began to write for himself. Hardly does any tale of wickedness and cruelty, or thrilling crisis of escape, elicit from him the warm sympathetic word which should make us feel him to be a man as well as a philosopher. His history makes about the same impression upon us as his well-known stately bust. It is cold, self-contained, and emotionless.

In Herodotus, on the contrary, we feel that we have a real human companion, and a frank and genial one. By degrees we seem almost to know him as a friend. We are willing that he should sit with us by the hour, and have no fear of being tired out with his spontaneous talk, or inexhaustible flow of anecdote. He makes no secret to us of his judgments or his feelings. He lets us see how everything that concerns his fellow-men has an interest for him. If it comes in his way, he will as soon tell of a babe's smile, of the beauty of a woman, of the passing tears of a king, as of battles and campaigns and empires. The old man has his foibles, no doubt: enlightened men call him credulous and superstitious; and there is no denying that he is now and then a little too ready to swallow a marvellous tale; but if that was the reason why his countrymen ridiculed and exiled him, as Mr. Rawlinson thinks, it was certainly more to their own discredit than his. We can imagine few things more pleasant, in the old Hellenic times, than to have shared the company of the good-natured traveller-historian in his quieter days at Thurii, and heard him tell some of those tales which had stirred his more youthful wonder and curiosity.

Perhaps more may be learned of the character of Herodotus than of his outward life. The former is written unmistakably in his own pages; of the latter we have little more than a few bare facts. We know that he was born at Halicarnassus, in the Dorian part of Asia Minor, about the year 484 B.C.; and the well-known epitaph, which Mr. Rawlinson thinks may be regarded as genuine, tells us that he was buried at Thurii. According to Suidas, he took a prominent part as liberator and tyrannicide in the politics of his native city; but the statement is unsupported, and therefore doubtful. We gather from his own words that his travels extended as far as Babylon and Assyria, Egypt and Cyrene, Thrace and Magna Græcia. The epitaph just before alluded to, tells us further that the displeasure—or ridicule, as Mr. Rawlinson translates it—of his fellow-citizens, was the occasion of his abandoning altogether the place of his birth. Athens was then in the height of her glory, before the outbreak of the



Peloponnesian war, and he would be naturally attracted thither.\* It was there, doubtless, that he made the friendship of the poet Sophocles, who in two curious passages,\* which cannot well be ascribed to coincidence, has invrought into his drama materials furnished by the historian. When somewhat over forty, probably, he joined a party of settlers from Athens for Thurii, in Magna Græcia, and with the exception of an occasional excursion to Athens or elsewhere, in that city he appears to have spent the remainder of his days. We are left chiefly to internal evidence, and that of a very inconclusive character, to determine the period at which his travels were undertaken and his history composed, while the date of his death is quite uncertain. The student will find all these points discussed with good sense and sufficient information in Mr. Rawlinson's first chapter.

But there are certain characteristic features of mind and heart which we need no learned research to recognise and appreciate in the 'Father of History.' They unfold themselves to every discerning, congenial reader, and as already observed, they are of such a kind as to win sympathy for the man no less than interest in his subject. Prominent among these is the kindly human feeling which pervades all that he has written. 'It is the spirit of gentle humanity in his bosom,' says Mr. Kenrick, 'which gives to his history the character of *ἡθος*,'—that is to say, of sympathy and interest. Nor is it a mere spurious sentimentalism, finding its needful excitement in tales of pathos, but rather the natural expression of a generous heart, and one that has felt the power of that mysterious bond in which the Creator has linked in one 'all the nations of the earth.' It is this feature, closely related as it is to his beautiful simplicity, which has given such a vitality to his varied narrative. Apart from the sacred Scriptures, perhaps no stories have been so often repeated or had so wide a circulation as his. They are the life of books like Rollin's *Ancient History*, and come upon us refreshingly in the more scientific pages of Grote. When Goldsmith commenced his *Animated Nature*, said Dr. Johnson, 'he will make it as interesting as a fairy tale.' And this is precisely what Herodotus—a somewhat kindred spirit to the author of the *Citizen of the World*—has done for the periods of history with which he deals. Apart from its historical value, which can scarcely be over-rated, his volume

\* See *Soph. Ant.* 905—912, as compared with *Herod.* iii. 119, and *O. C.* 337—341, with *Herod.* ii. 35. In the former *Antigone* gives an over-subtle reason for her devotion to Polynices; to wit, that she *might* get a new husband or another child to supply the place of a lost one, but as her parents were dead, never another brother. In the latter, *Œdipus* reproaches his sons with the effeminacy of the Egyptians, with whom men do the work of women, and women of men.

is as capable of holding the reader fast as *Don Quixote* or *Robinson Crusoe*.

The author of the treatise, *De Malignitate Herodoti*, published among the 'moral' works of Plutarch, but which Mr. Rawlinson would ascribe to some author who has made free with his name, begins his attack upon Herodotus by challenging both his simplicity and his kindly temper as counterfeit. 'Many persons,' he says, 'have been deceived by the apparently simple, easy style of Herodotus, and still more by his assumed moral features. For an unjust man to pretend to be just, says Plato, is the height of injustice; and to throw a mask of gentility and simplicity over extreme ill nature, is the last refinement of malignity.\* We are not careful to defend Herodotus from this charge of over-subtle wickedness. We are content to take him as we find him, and to trust the impression he invariably produces. The animus of the writer of the treatise is manifest throughout, and we agree with Mr. Long (*Dict. Biog.* art. Plutarch) in thinking that it 'neither requires nor merits refutation.' The inventor, if it be an invention, of the story of the meeting between Herodotus and Thucydides, to which we have already referred, better understood the amiable temper of our author. 'Olorus,' he is represented as saying to the lad's father, 'thy son's nature is yearning after study.' Herodotus was precisely the man so to appreciate and cherish the ingenuous enthusiasm of a youth.

Most readers of Herodotus have their favourites among his pleasant genial stories. To give him the credit of their invention would be but doubtful praise for an historian; but the air, colour, feeling, in which they appear, are his own. Dr. Arnold was especially fond of that tale of Cleobis and Bito; in whom the deity showed, by the reward bestowed upon their filial piety, that 'for man to die is better than to live.' (i. 31.) No less full of delicate pathos is the story of the sad fate of Adrastus, unintentionally the slayer of the son of the very man from whom, in exile and adversity, he had received kindness and protection (i. 31—45); or that of the dethroned Psammenitus, who witnesses with dry eyes the ignominy of himself, his sons, and his daughters, but bursts into tears at the sight of an old boon-companion of his court begging an alms. (iii. 14.) Equally beautiful, and in less gloomy vein, is that of Cleomenes and his little daughter Gorgo: how when the father, who chose to have his child with him in the room, was hard pressed by Aristagoras,

\* Κακοῦθειας ἄκρας ἔργον εὐκολίαν μιμούμενον καὶ ἀπλότητα, δυσφορώτατον εἶναι. (*Plut. de Malign. Herod. init.*)

envoy of the Ionian revolters, with higher and higher bribes, he was put on his guard by the little girl's speaking out—'Father, 'the stranger will corrupt you, if you don't go out of the way 'of him.' (v. 51.) Nor, well-known as it is, can we forbear here to refer to the words in which he has so fitly pictured the quick-coming emotions of the great king at the sight of his countless hosts gathered in review beneath him:—'And when he saw all 'the Hellespont hidden from sight by his ships, and all the 'shore, with the plains of Abydos, crowded with human beings, 'then Xerxes counted himself happy; afterwards he wept.' (vii. 45.) There is a prevailing tone of melancholy about his pictures of human life. He is fond of dwelling on the instability of fortune; the wakeful retribution of Nemesis, never failing to make a man smart for having been the subject of more than usual prosperity—the bitter that is dashed with every cup. Still we do not imagine him to have been an habitually melancholy man. Doubtless there was an element of pensiveness deeply interfused with the primary features of his character, which would be fostered by long, and, to a great extent, solitary wanderings. Moreover, have we not many of us felt how, when a man begins to think with sufficient steadiness to write upon any subject, often a deep underlying sadness will rise to the surface, and assume a prominence which he would hardly have suspected himself? So probably the book of Herodotus is more pensively melancholy than his life was; though even here we find often an indication of a lively pleasantry. 'There are several of his stories,' as Mr. Rawlinson remarks, 'of which the predominant characteristic is the humorous;' and the fact of his relating the pretty story of little Gorgo, or the infant Cypselus, seems to indicate that interest in children which is scarcely compatible with any other than an elastic and cheerful temperament. But the dark conceptions which he had formed of the Divine Being (see i. 32) seem to have weighed upon his mind; and for him there was but a faint light, if any, resting upon the path of human life, even where it slopes to the grave. We do not remember in his writings any trace of a belief in a future life. Nor must we fail to take into consideration the influence of the varied forms of evil and suffering with which he had become familiar in his extensive wanderings. The vices of other nations always strike us more painfully and revoltingly than our own; and their tendency, with a susceptible mind, is to depress and sadden.

For the moral nature of Herodotus we gain in reading him a high respect. We do not, of course, mean to say that he displays that profound insight into the nature of good and evil which was given by a higher revelation than any vouchsafed to him; but we

discern the workings of an active moral sense, and a genuine reverence for goodness, where he recognises it. He has confidence in those eternal laws whereby Divine power governs the course of this world; and if too much disposed to look out for a material retribution upon the evil-doer—a tendency which sometimes involves him in evident perplexity—he shows even in this a conscience untampered with by those sceptical sophistries which from his time onwards so undermined the morality of Greece. There is one expression, indeed, which might for a moment seem to imply sympathy with those speculators who recognised no other than an arbitrary distinction between the right and the wrong. It occurs as a kind of moralizing reflection on a curious story. (iii. 38.) The Callatian Indians, he tells us, made a practice of devouring the bodies of their parents. Darius summoned certain Greeks into his presence, and asked them on what conditions they would consent to do the same? The Greeks, of course, were horrified at the question. The king then inquired of those Indians what price would induce them to burn the bodies of their dead with fire? The cannibals burst out into a loud exclamation, and begged him to hold his peace. ‘So much for these customs, then,’ (οὕτω μὲν νῦν ταῦτα νενόμισται) says Herodotus; ‘and I am of opinion that the poet Pindar is right when he says, *Law (or custom) is lord of all.*’ Now if this were said in sober earnest, it must be confessed it would look something like an upsetting of morality. The quotation from Pindar is but a fragment, and but two or three more lines are preserved, the rest of the ode having perished. But in the *Gorgias* of Plato the very same words are actually appealed to by the revolutionary Callicles as bearing him out in his argument, that all so-called moral laws are delusions. (*Plat. Gorg.*, p. 484, B.) ‘Unpurchased Hercules’ (the Scholiast tells us how to complete the imperfect sentence) ‘drove off the cattle of Geryon, yet who ever ventured to blame him? Law is king of all then—might is right’—such is the conclusion arrived at by the ‘Minute Philosopher’ of Plato’s day. But evidently Herodotus has here an eye very much more to the quaintness of the story than to any ulterior conclusions. Pindar used the word *Nómos* in the sense of ordinance or destiny. Herodotus plays upon its additional meaning of custom. It would be too bad to condemn the historian in the high court of morality for an epigrammatic point attached to a good story. Mr. Rawlinson, we conceive, misses the mark when he says ‘Herodotus must have forgotten the context, and so given to the words of the poet quite a different sense from that which they were meant to bear.’

But there can be no question of the serious aspect in which

moral obligation presented itself to the mind of Herodotus. The whole tone of his thought and writing is that of a man who recognised the rightful supremacy of conscience. Very significant is his eulogy of the conduct of the Lacedæmonians in aiding the Athenians to expel their tyrants. In spite of the friendly relations existing between the Pisistratids and the city of Sparta, the Spartan government obeyed the command of the oracle to expel them; 'for,' says the historian, 'they held the gods in higher honour than men.' (v. 63.) There was no Hellenic people with whom he had more sympathy than the Athenians, or whom he is generally more ready to praise, yet he makes no attempt whatever to palliate the outrages which they perpetrated upon the Persian heralds, in violation of the law of nations. (vii. 133.) Very marked, too, is his revulsion of feeling in recording some signal instance of injustice and cruelty; as in the case of the murder—by a mode of death too shocking for him to describe, but which, if Mr. Rawlinson's very probable conjecture is correct, the less scrupulous Plutarch has not shrunk from describing with loathsome minuteness—of Polycrates by Orates (compare *Herod.* iii. 120, 125; and *Plut. Artax.* 16,) or of the sanguinary vindictiveness of Phereclæa, queen of Cyrene. (iv. 205.) The words in which he expresses his condemnation are few and simple, but none the less weighty. He is sometimes plain-spoken even to grossness; and one or two of his stories, we confess, would have been better omitted. But these blemishes belong, as Mr. Isaac Taylor remarks, 'not so much to the author as to his age,' and are comparatively few in number.

His religious feeling is strong and reverential, though deeply tinged with superstition. Very rarely, indeed, does a 'faint indication of scepticism,' as Mr. Grote calls it, 'escape him.' When a furious tempest was destroying the fleet of Xerxes, 'the Magians,' he tells us, 'by their sacrifices and incantations, at length allayed the wind after it had raged three days; or else, perhaps,' he adds quietly, 'it lulled of its own accord.' (vii. 191.) But his general tendency is to push to an extreme the doctrine of divine interposition. He recognises the beneficence of Providence in the provisions of nature; in the animal kingdom, for example, in the fecundity of the tame and harmless, and the comparative sterility of the wild and noxious beasts. (iii. 108.) In his travels he contemplates the various expressions of the religious spirit, not with an indifferent, but rather with a devout allowance. We could wish that he had been somewhat more free in the censures which he sometimes bestows on licence exercised under the mask of religious sanction (ii. 64); but that would be to expect too much from one whose national worship would doubt-

less partake of that immorality and sensuality which everywhere so sadly alloyed the religion of Greece. The prominent element in his devotion was evidently rather the fear of terror than of trust. He conceived of the Deity as a being too jealous of all elevation and greatness besides his own, to pour out his favours ungrudgingly, and 'deal bountifully with the sons of men.' His language on this point has been compared with that of the Old Testament Scriptures, but the resemblance is purely superficial, and confined to one or two words. No two conceptions of the Deity not absolutely irrational can possibly be more distinct than that which prevails throughout the whole of Herodotus, and that which is presented to us in that highest exponent of pious and reverential feeling, the *Book of Psalms*. And with regard to the special expression, 'jealousy' of the Deity, 'there is,' Mr. Rawlinson remarks, 'a clear distinction.' In the Herodotean conception (comp. i. 32 : and vii. 10, 46) it is simple prosperity and eminence which provoke his wrath; in the scriptural, it is pride and arrogance. It may be added, that the latter alone fully recognises Him as the author of 'prosperity and eminence,' no less than the avenger of 'pride and arrogance.'

A very pleasant feature in our author is the generous, cosmopolitan spirit in which he allows the claims of other nations to valour, truthfulness, virtue. Nurtured as he was, amid the noise of the conflict between east and west which he describes,—the battle of Marathon, that glorious præjudicium to the well-sustained struggle, was fought about six years before his birth, and he would be about four or five years old when Salamis was won,—he cherished in his bosom all the patriotism of a Greek. Yet never does he withhold from the enemies of Greece their due praise. 'It is evidently his earnest wish and aim,' Mr. Rawlinson remarks, 'to do justice to the enemy no less than to his countrymen. . . . The personal prowess of the Persians is declared to be not a whit inferior to that of the Greeks, and constant apologies are made for their defeats, which are ascribed to deficiencies in their arms, equipment, or discipline, not to any want of courage or military spirit.' (vol. i. p. 86.) It is curious that this generous tribute paid by the historian to the enemies of Greece, should be singled out by the pseudo-Plutarch as an illustration of the jealousy of Herodotus, who could not be content to award to the Spartans their full meed of praise. (*De Mal. Herod. fin.*) As if it could be any credit to gain victories over cowards!

Turning from the emotional and moral to the more purely intellectual side of his nature, we find a lively curiosity about all those matters which the extension of knowledge has since assigned

to this or that special science. Besides history proper, archæology, etymology, zoology, botany, geology, meteorology, all are more or less represented. He shows a vivid impressibility for the wonderful; as when he seems utterly bewildered by the intricacy of the Egyptian labyrinth (ii. 148), or refrains from telling how enormous was the yield of certain grains in Babylonia, because he is certain that none but those who have had the evidence of actual eyesight, could give it credence. (i. 193.) He is careful to ascertain the truth if possible. If he has heard one story from the priests of Memphis, which strikes him as somewhat doubtful, he is willing to undertake a further journey of inquiry to Heliopolis and to Thebes, 'to find out whether the information there obtained would tally with that obtained at Memphis.' (ii. 3.) One only regrets, as Mr. Rawlinson remarks, that with so much conscientious painstaking he was so often misled. His faculty of observation seems to have been active. When standing on the battle-field of Pelusium, where lay heaps of Egyptian and Persian skulls, he notes that the latter are so thin and fragile that he can break them by just pitching a pebble at them, while the former are thick and strong; and he agrees with those who ascribe the difference to the different habits of the two nations, in wearing the head covered or exposed. (iii. 12.) He is on the look-out especially for differences of manners and customs; and remarks such facts as that the Egyptians in weaving thrust the wool *down* the warp, while other nations thrust it *up*;—though here he is partially misled by a love of antithesis, for we learn from the monuments (see *R.* vol. ii. p. 55) that both modes were occasionally followed. He marks how when the Nile begins to rise, 'the hollows in the land and the marshy spots near the river, are flooded before any other places by the percolation of the water through the river-banks,' and how, when its waters return upon the dry channels, 'the young fish immediately make their appearance from the spawn of last year;' with a vast number of like curious facts. Yet sometimes he errs strangely, where we might fairly expect accuracy. Thus he tells us (ii. 12) that he had visited the nome of Papremis, which was, he states, in another place, the only abode of the hippopotamus, and yet his description of that animal is grossly inaccurate. He actually gives to it the mane and neighing cry of a horse, with the hoof of an ox. (ii. 71.) Nor is the case much improved if we accept the tradition that he was here transcribing from his predecessor, Hecateus. And the account of the crocodile, which he had doubtless seen again and again, is not quite free from error. (ii. 68.) The story of the leeches which harbour in its mouth, is known to be fabulous. Where he had no opportunity of per-

sonal observation, it is less surprising that he should perpetrate some absurdities. As yet science did not exist, and apart from it, who shall say where incredibility begins? The theory which Herodotus propounds (ii. 21, *sqq.*) to explain the inundation of the Nile in the summer months,—or rather, for that is the view which he seems to have taken of the matter, the diminution of its stream during the winter,—namely, that in the latter season, the sun is ‘driven by the cold north winds to ‘seek a retreat in the upper parts of Libya, and consequently ‘presses unfairly upon the sources of the river,’ looks absurd enough to us, it is true. And perhaps it may even have fallen behind the scientific knowledge of the age. But the chief absurdity will disappear if we can realize to ourselves what was the prevalent belief of the ancient world, that the sun, moon, and stars, were animated, conscious beings. Even the materialistic Lucretius conceives the movements of the planets and other celestial bodies may be directed by their appetite for appropriate stellar pabulum :—

‘ sive ipsi serpere possunt  
Quo cujusque cibus vocat, atque invitat cuntes.’  
(*De Rer. Nat.* v. 523-4.)

But it is hard, we confess, to excuse him, when he gravely tells us (iii. 108) that the lioness litters but once in her life, and then gives birth to only a single cub: utterly heedless of the immediate inference, that accordingly the whole leonine race must be dying out in a decreasing geometrical progression. Unless, indeed, which we cannot imagine, he recognised in this arrangement an express provision of nature.

It would be unfair to overlook the fact that Herodotus himself, when reporting something more than usually difficult of belief, often warns his reader of its doubtful character. Such saving clauses as the following are common with him: ‘so they told me; but the thing seems to me incredible;’ or, ‘with respect to ‘this matter, I neither believe it nor disbelieve it entirely;’ or, ‘it may be true; we don’t know what may come to pass in a ‘length of time.’ Nor can we blame him for sometimes introducing into his narrative what he regarded as thus doubtful. Had he always rejected what appeared to him incredible we should have lost one or two extremely interesting bits of information. Thus, for example, he tells us he is unable to credit the reports which were brought to him of a river named Eridanus, flowing into a sea in the north of Europe, by the estuary of which was found amber. (iii. 115.) It is true we are not able to identify the precise river, but the general statement is suffi-



cient evidence that even at that early period some communication existed between the shores of the Baltic and the Mediterranean. To another important instance of the same kind we shall have occasion to refer by-and-by. 'It may fairly be doubted,' remarks Mr. Rawlinson, 'whether the retrenchment of a certain number 'of traveller's tales, palmed upon the unsuspectingness of our 'author by untruthful persons or humourists, would have compensated for the loss of these important scraps of knowledge 'which we only obtain through his habit of reporting even what 'he disbelieved.'—(vol. i. p. 102.)

Taken all in all, and with due allowance for drawbacks inseparable from his age, the 'father of history' was beyond dispute an honest, right-hearted, sensible man, and a fine specimen of the earlier and less subtilized type of Hellenic mind. The result of extensive research, as well as of careful and candid reading, has been to seat him more firmly than ever on the pedestal upon which an age singularly susceptible to the claims of genius seems at once to have placed him. His credibility has been often assailed, but never stood higher than it now does. Perhaps the most direct challenge of his veracity ever offered was the Assyrian and Persian history of Ctesias, who flourished not many years later than Herodotus. Ctesias was seventeen years physician at the court of Artaxerxes Mnemon; and as Greek physicians were held in high honour amongst the Persians, he would naturally enjoy unusual opportunities for obtaining correct information. We are informed, indeed, that he professed to have drawn his materials from certain royal skins, or parchments, which contained the archives of the kingdom. He appears to have openly and even violently impeached the veracity of Herodotus. We unfortunately possess but a partial epitome and a few fragments of his extensive work; but we learn from the same source to which we are indebted for the preservation of even so much—the learned Photius—that he explicitly called Herodotus 'a liar,' and 'contradicted him in almost everything.\*' An impeachment coming from such a source would naturally carry some weight with it; and there have been many who have upheld the title of the Cnidian physician to be preferred to the elder historian. Plutarch shows in his life of Artaxerxes that he put little faith in Ctesias, and can scarcely mention his name with any show of respect; but in so doing he seems to have stood pretty much alone among ancient writers; and the learned H. Stephens, who was the first to publish the fragments we possess, pleads vehemently on his

\* . . . σχεδὸν ἐν ᾗπασιν ἀντικείμενα 'Προδότην ἱστορῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ ψευστήν αὐτὸν ἀποκαλῶν, κ. τ. λ.

behalf. But at present he seems to lie low indeed: 'none so low to do him reverence.' To quote the words of Mr. Rawlinson:—  
 'A comparison with the Jewish Scriptures, and with the native  
 'history of Berosus, first raised a general suspicion of the bad  
 'faith of Ctesias: . . . at last the *coup-de-grace* has been given  
 'to his small remaining reputation by the recent cuneiform dis-  
 'coveries, which convict him of having striven to rise into notice  
 'by a system of *enormous lying*, to which the history of literature  
 'scarcely presents a parallel.'—(vol. i. pp. 78, 79.)

We must confess we have no great respect for the character of Ctesias as an author. The little preserved of his writings seems to us to indicate an inferior order of mind, and a feeling and taste far beneath comparison with Herodotus. Moreover, the marvels which he describes in his *Indian History* are beyond measure more preposterous and offensive than any recorded in his predecessor. A pigmy race, averaging between two and three feet in height, with enormous beards and hair forming their clothing, and possessing a proportionately diminutive breed of cattle;—people with big, flappy ears, reaching to their elbows, and whose women bear but once in the course of their lives;—black, dog-headed people, who howl instead of speaking articulately, and while they can understand when they are spoken to, are obliged to answer with their hands and fingers, like the deaf and dumb;—such are the monstrosities which form the substance, and not the mere embellishment, of what is preserved to us of the *Indica* of Ctesias, and which, according to Photius, he actually vouched for the truth of. Yet in the absence of the actual works of the author, we should be unwilling to condemn him in such unqualified terms as those we have quoted. It seems clear, as we shall by-and-by show, that he did not avail himself of the information conveyed by that most important monument at Behistun, which has yielded such interesting results to modern investigators; and his neglect in this instance may well lead us to look with some suspicion upon his other vaunted resources. The man who could not even copy down correctly the names of seven doubtless well-known conspirators from a great national commemorative inscription, is not to be very implicitly trusted where the difficulties in the attainment of truth are greater. Yet we do not imagine him to have been wilfully and purposely false. Even Plutarch credits him where he imagines he could have no reason to deceive; and what reason could he have for publishing among Greeks an incorrect list of the names of men concerned in a plot with which that people could have no possible interest, saving the historical one? unless, perchance, it were simply to contradict Herodotus; but if this had been his object he would surely

have corrected the one name which in the list of Herodotus appears to be erroneous. We imagine that his errors are rather to be ascribed to ignorance or indolence, or even stupidity, than to deliberate mendacity; and while we scarcely feel that eager interest in him which led his learned editor so to long that 'in some corner or other' an entire copy of his works might turn up,\* we yet feel that it is only just to give him all the benefit of the very imperfect and mutilated condition in which he makes his appearance before us.

In one instance Mr. Rawlinson seems to have imputed to him a palpable and very serious error on insufficient grounds. Ctesias 'does not allow,' he says, in enumerating some of his misstatements, 'that Cambyses went to Egypt.' (vol. i. p. 69.) Is this, indeed, the case? We do not so understand Ctesias; or rather the report of him which Photius has given us. The epitome is here extremely concise, and in the absence of other authorities might perhaps be understood as implying that the Egyptian expedition was deputed to the eunuch Bagapates. But such is certainly not the necessary, nor we think the most obvious interpretation. At any rate there is no doubt about the fact of *an* Egyptian expedition being recorded by Ctesias, as Mr. Rawlinson's words might lead the unwary to suppose: the only possible question is whether or no it was conducted by Cambyses in person. We will give as much of the passage as is necessary in order to enable the reader to judge for himself, whether or no Mr. Rawlinson has been too hasty in his censure:—

'The man who had most weight with him (Cambyses) was Artasyras, an Hyrcanian; and among the eunuchs, Ixabates and Aspadates, and also Bagapates, who had very great influence with his father. After the death of Petisaces, this (*man* or *king*) marches against Egypt and Amyrtæus, King of the Egyptians . . . . he took the king prisoner, but did him no further harm than transporting him with six thousand of his countrymen to Susa. And he reduced all Egypt to subjection.'

We can conceive the reader's feeling a slight uncertainty as to who is meant by the *οὔτρος*, whether it be the king or his favourite; but we can scarcely understand how Mr. Rawlinson should venture to say so dogmatically that it does *not* mean Cambyses. This, we imagine, is a case in which misunderstanding has resulted from the brevity natural to an epitomator. Here we may, for the present at least, take leave of Ctesias. From a vindication of Herodotus we have almost been led into a vindication of his accuser. Such are the natural reactions from unmeasured

\* See the Dissertation of H. Stephens prefixed to his recension of the remains of Ctesias.

words. Ctesias levels at Herodotus the ill name of 'liar'; Mr. Rawlinson, in his eagerness to defend his favourite author, retorts upon him in yet stronger terms, and lays himself fairly open to the charge of unfounded accusation.

We have already bestowed sufficient notice upon the tract ascribed to Plutarch. The 'father of history' has little to fear from such accusations as those with which it is filled. All we claim for him is, that he be regarded as a candid and truthful witness. He may fall into serious errors, may occasionally perpetrate even gross absurdities: this we do not wish to deny; but of all wilful falsity, slanderous distortion of facts, 'malignant' jealousy against any one, we hold him guiltless.

Herodotus begins his greatest and only surviving work with a preamble, in which something of the consciousness of power which belongs to genius, as well as something of its modesty, appears:—

'Here are set forth the researches of Herodotus of Halicarnassus, to the end that the doings of men may be saved from being effaced with years, and that the great and wonderful achievements, whether of Greeks or barbarians, may not become lost in obscurity: telling what else they did, and wherefore they went to war with each other.'

Such a preliminary speech is inconceivable in our days. The thought embodied in it takes us back to the very infancy of pure narrative writing, to the time when men began first to be consciously aware of that advancing cloud of oblivion which threatens to swallow up, generation after generation, the words and deeds of men. At an earlier date, the need of history had not been felt. The actions of gods and heroes were sung by minstrels or rhapsodists, at banquets and in the streets: and the eminently national poetry of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, with the at least equally elaborate productions of the poets of the cycle, had shed a lustre round certain royal families and certain wars; but the very celebrity of these favoured themes operated to the prejudice of others quite as important. Only within the last two or three centuries has scientific history shaken itself quite clear of the absurdities into which chroniclers were beguiled by that bewitching *ignis fatuus* of the Trojan war. In ancient times the spell was omnipotent. Hardly an historical event, the foundation of a colony, or the name of a city or people, fails to find some illustration from that marvellous sphere of myth and fable about which played the poetical genius of Hellas; as if otherwise it were lacking its passport into the sphere of history.

Between this mythical age and Herodotus, intervene some seven or eight hundred years. And scanty, indeed, are the re-

mains left us of this long period. The 'bloom-time' of the Epos,—when the heroic deed was scarcely wrought ere it had become the theme of every minstrel's lay, and 'the freshest song floated over most welcome round the listener's ear,'—was soon over; and the graver muse had not yet arisen to take her sister's place, and gather up from the stream of time the less brilliant, but not less precious waifs of fact and tradition, ere they plunged beneath the abyss of forgetfulness. It was a time not signalized by any very stirring events; none to be compared with the famous enterprise of Greece:

Conjurata . . . rumpere nuptias  
Et regnum Priami vetus,

or the two great struggles which became the chosen subjects respectively of Herodotus and Thucydides. Yet the 'sacro quia' current vate' will be doubtless as fair an explanation of the oblivion of this period as of the age 'before Agamemnon;' only it was the chronicler and not the bard that was wanting. This want began to be felt and supplied in the century before the birth of Herodotus. We have still the names and the titles of the works of some of his predecessors, and but little more. The beginnings of history have been, in most literatures, comparatively dry and bald; and Cicero found a parallel to the dull, styleless, annalists of early Roman history, in the writers to whom we are now referring. One or two scraps from their extant fragments are given by Mr. Rawlinson by way of specimen, and it must be confessed they are not such as to deepen our sense of loss in respect of their literary merits. Hecataeus, the senior of Herodotus by a generation, was probably the most distinguished of these early chroniclers:—*λογοποιοί*, as they are designated. Unfortunately nothing is preserved which can enable us to form a fair estimate of his powers; but he had the reputation of writing a very pure and simple style, and was regarded as a model in Ionic Greek. His ancestry appears to have been distinguished, for we find him tracing himself up to a god at the sixteenth remove (*Herod.* ii. 143); and his social position must have been influential, since we find him summoned among the leaders of the great Ionic revolt to their secret councils, where his advice, as recorded by Herodotus, is marked by sagacity and foresight (v. 36). Hellanicus was rather the contemporary than the predecessor of Herodotus; and the same must be said of Xanthus the Lydian, and Charon of Lampsacus. A few other names of less note we have no need to mention here. There can be little doubt that Herodotus deserved to eclipse these men as he has done. His claims to immortality as a writer were probably as

much superior to theirs as was the genius of Homer to that of the nebulous multitude of smaller, nameless poets, whose rays shine faintly upon us through the interval of near three thousand years.

The title given by Herodotus to his work is worthy of note. It is *ιστορία*—research, inquiry; for the word had not yet acquired the technical sense of *history*. No other could have been used so suggestive of the mode in which his materials were gathered; it was literally by personal search and exploration. Like a certain later philosopher, if he would know the world he must mete the same ‘with a pair of compasses belonging to himself only.’ Many of the early sages of Greece, it is worthy of remark, were great travellers. Solon, Democritus, Heraclitus, may be mentioned among the number; and Herodotus is not unworthy of being classed with them. Few pursuits, indeed, could present stronger contrasts *then* and *now* than that of the historian. Our Macaulay or Froude may be compared to the builder whose rich quarries are still continually within the reach of his workmen’s tools. The ancient historian is the collector of a museum, who must seek historic memorials on ancient walls or beneath overgrown battle-fields, geological specimens in the various strata of the crust of the earth, and illustrations of men and manners all over the world. In these days, so vast are the materials accumulated from past ages, a man may write history almost without stirring from his study, except it be to avail himself of the richer and less familiar stores of some public library or office. Engaged in quiet, sedentary labours, he may lead an unadventurous life far more exposed to perils of dyspepsia than to perils by ‘land and sea.’ If he is in doubt as to some route, or the site of some town, here are accurate maps enabling him at a glance to comprehend the geographical structure of any historical country. If he is checked for a moment by some paper in a strange tongue, here are grammars and dictionaries which will furnish him with a key to every language under the sun; to say nothing of the probability that within four-and-twenty hours he may succeed in putting himself in communication with some scholar or missionary, who will save him all further trouble by translating it at once.

Very different was it with Herodotus; all his materials were in the rough. Hardly for a single one of his facts, probably, was he indebted to a written book. For the physical features of a people or country he must depend mainly upon his own eyes, or upon verbal reports; and from ignorance of foreign languages, his more strictly historical information would often have to pass through the channel of interpretation. Many historical memo-

rials existed, as Mr. Rawlinson observes, especially in Greece, which would form a check upon tradition, but he would 'more commonly be obliged 'to draw his information from men.' Not the least interesting portion of his narrative consists of accounts caught up from men who had themselves fought in the battles he describes, or who had heard their countrymen or ancestors recount the part they had taken in them. Maps were not absolutely unknown, but they were extremely imperfect. In one passage Herodotus expresses himself as greatly amused with the absurd diagrams which, in his day, passed for representations of the earth's surface. 'It makes him laugh,' he says, 'to see so many 'people drawing maps of the world without any good sense to 'guide them; making the Oceanus flow round the world, which 'appears circular, just as if it had been turned with a lathe, and 'Asia and Europe of the same magnitude.' (iv. 36.) It is pleasant to find the generally grave old man beguiled of a laugh; though the idea of the *exactness* of the rotundity of our earth was a little nearer the truth than he imagined. Undoubtedly, these early attempts at chartography *were* very strange and preposterous; and even such as they were, they would be practically available only for a very small area. The centre of illumination would be in tolerable clear light; but as the traveller made his way east, west, north, or south, darkness would soon begin to gather round him. If his map told him anything at all of these outer regions, it would be of sirens, Hyperboreans who preserved the traditions of the golden age, or of

'Gorgons and hydras, and chimeras dire.'

And if there was a freshness of adventure and a sense of mystery attaching to travel in those days, it had its share of terrors. The great Atlantic, into which opened the 'pillars of Hercules,' is now daily traversed by vessels whose crews are as familiar with its currents as the Grecian ships ever became with the Sigean waters; to say nothing of the electric cable, which, when we are out of sight of its grandeur, seems almost to have contracted its broad expanse into insignificance. But it would need some enterprise and heroism in a ship-master to keep his sail hard up against the wind when, for aught he knew, he might be scudding towards those unmercantile shores where Ulysses could only extort from the man-eating Polyphemus, in return for his super-excellent wine, the privilege of being the last devoured; or where the Cimmerians, unblest of the gods, prolonged a pitiful existence, never gladdened by the beams of Helios. Add to this the more real perils of imperfect navigation, barbarous people, national jealousies, and numberless others, which must be encountered in

person, and the calling of a traveller-historian in the fifth century before Christ, presents abundant attractions to an adventurous spirit, but would hardly be the chosen career of all who, with us, bear the name of historian.

It is perhaps worthy of remark that chatty and full of talk as our travelled author is, he gives us none of his own adventures. Wherever he introduces himself, which he very frequently does, it is always simply in the character of a witness to facts. An ingenuous modesty along with a sense of the dignity and province of historical research prevented him, or doubtless he might have told

‘of most disastrous chances,  
Of moving accidents by flood and field,’

which had fallen to the lot of himself. But apart from his own individual feeling there is a sobriety about the prose literature of the best period of Greece, which would have at once condemned such narratives as egotistical. Thus while very different from any modern work of history, it is, in this respect, no less distinct in character from a modern book of travels.

Within the last few years some important contributions have been made by English scholars to our Herodotean literature. To go no further back than 1841, Mr. Kenrick's edition of the *Egyptian History*, to which reference has already been made, contains some valuable introductory essays, and excellent grammatical and illustrative notes. An edition of the entire nine books from the same hand would have been welcome. Mr. Wheeler has prepared a very useful manual for the geography of Herodotus; and, in our opinion with less judgment, has attempted a sort of ‘romance’ of the life of the historian. In spite of certain high authorities, it seems undesirable to overlay with fiction the framework of the life of any real historical personage; and Mr. Wheeler's success is scarcely so brilliant as to justify an attempt in itself injudicious. Very recently Mr. Blakesley has edited *Herodotus* for the *Bibliotheca Classica*, now publishing under the superintendence of Messrs. Long and Maclean, and which promises to form the most valuable series of Latin and Greek authors issued from an English press. Mr. Blakesley's is a useful edition, and contains much new and valuable information. Occasionally, however, the editor falls into mistakes, which a better critical judgment, or a more accurate scholarship, might have avoided. We have not, of course, perused the whole of his notes, but would just call his attention to one or two points which have caught our eye. Mr. Blakesley's mode of treating a difficult passage, which occurs in i. 27, seems to us extremely



unsatisfactory. He suggests that we should strike out the *εὐχέσθαι* . . . a most arbitrary proceeding, as we imagine any scholar besides himself would admit—and translate: ‘What else do you think that the islanders look for (other than what is likely to happen—viz., the utter annihilation of Cræsus’s fleet) the instant they heard that you were going to build a fleet to attack them—with their ardent wishes (!) that they might only fall in with the Lydians afloat,’ &c. Mr. Rawlinson renders more faithfully, though less verbally: ‘But what thinkest thou the islanders desire better, now that they hear thou art about to build ships, and sail against them, than to catch the Lydians at sea,’ &c. The only difficulty is with the word *ἀρόμενοι*, which is evidently introduced with more regard to the sense than the syntax. In iii. 40, he has made an alteration which is equally unwarranted, transferring the words *ἐναλλάξ πρήσσω* from the place where they regularly stand, after *αἰῶνα*, to the end of the preceding clause, and translating as follows:—‘And I may say that I wish, both for myself and my connexions, to speed here and to fail there in my doings, with chequered fortune; and (I hold) *that so one’s life is better* (*διαφέρειν*) than that one should have luck in everything.’ Here again we have no hesitation in saying Mr. Rawlinson is more correct. He renders: ‘My wish for myself, and for those whom I love, is to be now successful, and now to meet with a check; *thus passing through life* amid alternatq good and ill rather than with perpetual good fortune.’ In iii. 88, while speaking of the greatness of Darius, Herodotus tells us, ‘he formed such marriage alliances as to a Persian would seem of the highest lustre’ (*γάμους τοὺς πρώτους ἐγάμε Πέρσῃσι*). This Mr. Blakesley renders: ‘The first marriages which he made were with Persians.’ Here Mr. Rawlinson is equally in error; as, indeed, are all the translators whom we have examined.\* In spite of blemishes such as these, Mr. Blakesley’s edition will be found to furnish valuable help to the student, though it has not put him in a position to dispense with the copious and learned commentaries of Bühr.

The chief interest of Mr. Rawlinson’s elaborate and richly illustrated work is derived from the new light cast upon both Assyrian and Persian history by recent discoveries. Two volumes only have as yet appeared, comprising the translation and illustrations to the first three books. As these contain the Assyrian, Lydian, Median, Egyptian, with the most important part of Persian history, and consequently demand the most extensive

\* *Translators*, not critics or grammarians. The true rendering is given in Jelf (Kühner) § 600-1, and elsewhere.

illustration, we may perhaps expect the entire work to be completed with two additional volumes. The work has been prepared with the invaluable co-operation of Colonel Sir H. C. Rawlinson and Sir J. G. Wilkinson; the former perhaps better qualified than any other man in Europe to render such service in reference to the Asiatic part; and the latter a name equally familiar to us from his Egyptian researches. Colonel Rawlinson's translation of the most important of the recently deciphered documents has been before the public since the year 1846, being published in the tenth volume of the *Royal Asiatic Journal*; but in the interval opportunity has been afforded for further study, and the maturing of judgments; and aspects have since presented themselves to his mind which at that period were not discerned.

For a considerable time much scepticism was entertained respecting the decipherment of these cuneiform inscriptions. Nor could this be considered unreasonable, when the fate of the Punic speech in Plantus showed how illusive were such interpretations when based upon insufficient data or imperfect philology. Dr. Young had succeeded in finding and using the key to the Egyptian hieroglyphics enclosed in the famous Rosetta stone; but here was no translation in any known language or alphabet. Everything was equally unknown; the subject, the language, and the character. Clearly the first step must be to arrive at a knowledge of the last; but even supposing this done, the result might possibly only render the enigma more hopeless. We have Etruscan inscriptions in Latin letters, which baffle all our comparative philology; and so of course it might have been here.

Yet in spite of these difficulties, the efforts of oriental scholars have been directed to these remarkable records found in various parts of what was once the Persian empire, and recently, in vast abundance, at Nimroud, Khorsabad, and elsewhere, ever since the beginning of the present century. Professor Grotefend of Göttingen was the first to break ground, and to him belongs the honour of earliest discovery. Two short inscriptions at Persepolis had been carefully copied by the distinguished traveller Niebuhr, father of the historian, and on these he set to work. As early as the year 1802, he announced in the *Göttingen Literary Gazette* that he had made some progress towards decipherment. But neither he nor his successor and contemporary in the same labours, St. Martin, discovered enough to enable them to effect anything in the way of translation. Subsequent research has confirmed about one-fourth of the phonetic values assigned by Professor Grotefend to the forty different cuneiform characters employed in these inscriptions, and the amount of command which this measure of knowledge would give him over

the various alphabetical combinations, may be appreciated by trying the effect produced upon the legibility of a sentence in English or Latin by substituting a cipher for every letter, except some six of the most important previously agreed upon. Thus, for example, reserving the three sharp mutes *p, t, k*, the sibilant *s*, and the vowels *a* and *u*, and substituting an arbitrary sign for the remaining characters, the first line of a well-known Latin poem will appear thus:—

‘A\*1A 23\*UIQU4 CA56 T\*678 QU3 P\*41US A9 6\*1S.’

We wonder what an Englishman altogether ignorant of Latin would make of a whole paragraph of the same poem, in which the known should throughout bear the same proportion to the unknown as it does in this one line? Yet this was actually Grotefend's position with regard to the cuneiform Persian writing. Only it was still further complicated by a supposed knowledge of what was really unknown; for he assigned values to *all* the characters. It is obvious that under such circumstances the attempt at interpretation must needs be altogether illusive. In Colonel Sir H. Rawlinson's very complete and elaborate ‘Memoirs of Cuneiform Discovery,’ published in the volume of the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, to which we have already referred, and to which we are indebted for these particulars, a tabular view is presented of the alphabetical results arrived at by the above-named scholars, and their successors, Rask, Burnouf, Lassen, and the author of the Memoir himself. Some of the results thus presented to the eye are very curious and interesting. Grotefend, as we have intimated, appears somewhat rash; St. Martin has made little positive advance, but clears the ground by marking as doubtful or absolutely unknown many characters which the former seemed sure of; while he retains all those which subsequent inquiry has authenticated. To Rask are assigned two fresh identifications. Burnouf is in agreement with the ultimate results to the extent of one-half of the entire number. Lassen and Rawlinson differ but in two or three letters. Nowhere is there a decidedly retrograde movement. Eight characters in Grotefend's list are found without fluctuation in all the successive lists, while fresh ones are gradually dropping into their proper places.

And if, so far, we have all the signs of *bonâ fide* discovery—the very precipitateness of the original discoverer perhaps deserving to be ranked as one of them—much more conclusive does the argument become when it is borne in mind that at least one of these courses of investigation was independent of the others. When Colonel Rawlinson began his labours some thirty

years ago, he had not, he informs us, even seen the alphabets of Grottefend and St. Martin. He was aware that they professed to have made out the names of Darius and one or two other kings, but that was the extent of his information. Not that he appears in the least degree disposed to undervalue the labours of his predecessors; but in a matter of this kind a comparison of the results obtained by perfectly independent experiments must necessarily be far more convincing and satisfactory than any, however systematic and coherent, which are based upon but a single one. Colonel Rawlinson has given us some account of his mode of operation.\* The inscription which he selected for his purpose was found at Hamadan, and, like all the rest, with one exception, was trilingual. Of this he made a careful copy, so as to study it at his leisure. Of the three versions, as he had reason to believe them to be, he selected for his first trials that which appeared the least complex—a fortunate choice, as will appear in the sequel. One of the first things which struck him, upon carefully inspecting it, was this. At about the middle there was a repetition of the very same combinations of characters which appeared at the commencement, with certain quite distinct exceptions forming groups by themselves. It was Colonel Rawlinson's ingenious conclusion that the parts corresponding partook of the nature of formulae or titles, the variable portions being proper names. With this extremely probable assumption, he then proceeded to make trial of particular names; and the aforesaid groups being three in number, it was but natural that the first suggesting themselves to him should be those of Darius, Hystaspes, Xerxes. These, if the results are to be relied on, as we fully believe they are, were the identical names which the inscription before him contained. One after the other, he proceeded to compare these names with the separate groups; observing how far the number of phonetic sounds they were composed of tallied with the number of cuneiform characters; noting the recurrence or non-recurrence of the same element, and the results obtained by assuming one phonetic value after another as he was enabled with any probability to do so, and applying it to other fresh groups. Of course, it was work demanding unwearied patience and perseverance; but he at length arrived at a more or less probable determination of the principal phonetic symbols in the words with which he began to work.

This done, the nature of his further progress may be to some extent, not followed, indeed, but imagined. Colonel Rawlinson does not himself go into particulars; but it is competent for any

\* *Journal of R. A. S.*, vol. x.

person to repeat the experiment who is willing to face the labour. Sufficient materials are furnished in the various portions of the great Behistun inscription, of which a clear and careful copy is given in the volume of the *Royal Asiatic Journal* before referred to. The only possible test of success was to be found in applying the values assumptively established to one group of characters after another, and seeing whether the results thus obtained were phonetic combinations capable of being articulated, and also of yielding an intelligible meaning when brought under the light of comparative philology. And happily Colonel Rawlinson, though impelled only by the natural desire to begin with the more simple document, had made choice of that version, which, from being in an Arian dialect, presented far more numerous points of contact with known languages, than either of the others, which appear to be in Semitic and Turanian dialects respectively. Had he unfortunately made choice of either the Sæythic or Babylonian tablets, the probabilities of success would have been incalculably farther removed. By the help of the former, either of the two latter may be, with considerable certainty, deciphered; but without it they would probably have remained an unsolved problem.\* Our materials for the study of a new Semitic language are poor compared with those presented by the numerous and critically known varieties of Arian speech; while the Turanian dialects vary extensively, and to all appearance, arbitrarily, in those important elements, which, in the Arian tribe, are almost constant quantities.

But, assuming the language under examination to be of the Arian tribe, it might be confidently expected that, as soon as the phonetic values were correctly ascertained, some of those well-nigh invariable elements would begin to turn up. The words *father, mother, brother, me, thee, one, two, three*, and the other numerals as far as ten, are among this very large class of roots, some or other of which would be certain to make their appearance in even a brief document. Now, let us look at some of the words which are brought out by the application of Colonel Rawlinson's key to the cipher. Some of the most familiar-looking are the following:—*Pitâ, mûtâ, brâtâ, nâmâ, mâm*. These, it must be

\* In 1850 Colonel Rawlinson declared that 'after having mastered every Babylonian letter and every Babylonian word to which any clue existed in the trilingual tablets, either by direct evidence or by induction,' he felt 'tempted . . . to abandon altogether the study of the Assyrian inscriptions *in utter despair*.'—*R. A. S. Journal*, vol. xii. Yet all authorities seem to be agreed as to their Semitic character. It may be conceived then what would have been the chances of his success had he commenced with the Babylonian version, without the help of any key at all. Mr. Norris's Memoir on the so-called Median documents, in vol. xv. of the Society's *Journal*, shows how very limited is the acquaintance obtained with the Turanian.

confessed, bear a strong family resemblance to words with which we are well enough acquainted. Three of them at least any English mother would accept as sufficiently intelligible from the lips of a three years' child ; while in Sanscrit, a language of more immediate affinity, the whole of them are found, letter for letter, as regular grammatical forms of well-known roots. *Pitâ, mâtâ, brâtâ, nâma*, are respectively the nominative cases of the Sanscrit words for *father, mother, brother, name* ; while *mâm* is in the same language the accusative of the personal pronoun *I* ; and, thus accordingly they have been identified. Nor are these by any means isolated instances, as those who will consult Colonel Rawlinson's Memoir may very soon convince themselves. Not a meaning has, we believe, been assigned to a single word, except on the strength of positive identity with, or strong resemblance to, known forms in some cognate language.

These results, taken in connexion with the quite coherent and satisfactory nature of the translation based upon them, are amply sufficient to justify confidence in the discoveries made ; and the documents thus laid open to us form an important addition to our sources of Persian history. We need not here follow further the progress of cuneiform discovery. Colonel Rawlinson has in the interval seen reason to modify some of his translations, but his general results have been thoroughly authenticated. And the *experimentum crucis* of the cylinder of Tiglath Pileser, may be considered as having set the question almost equally at rest with regard to the Assyrian Shemitic inscriptions.\*

We now proceed briefly to notice the evidence furnished by one of the most important of these newly-deciphered documents, and its bearing upon the narrative of Herodotus. It is the great inscription of Behistun. On a scarp'd rock, part of the ancient Mons Bagistanus (now Behistun), which rises some 1700 feet from the great plain of Kermanshah in the west of Persia, still exists almost unimpaired a monument erected to perpetuate the glory of the first king of the house of Hystaspes. At an elevation of 300 feet from the ground, a smooth surface has been hewn to receive the sculpture, the rock being cut away a few inches in a horizontal direction, so that the tablet stands like a picture in a frame. There is bare foot-room on the ledge at the base, and the ascent from below is difficult, and requires some nerve. Evidently every precaution was taken to prevent the monument

\* A lithographed copy of the cylinder inscription was prepared 'under the superintendence of Sir H. Rawlinson, by the authority of the trustees of the British Museum, under the sanction of the Government,' and placed in the hands of each of the four gentlemen who took part in the experiment. These were Sir H. Rawlinson, Dr. Hincks, Dr. Oppert, and W. H. F. Talbot. See *Athenæum* for Feb. 20, 1853.

from being destroyed by a jealous or iconoclastic foe. The success has been almost perfect; the tide of Mohammedanism has swept through the country, demolishing images and image-temples, but this rock-hewn record of the glories of the conquered race and defunct creed has escaped its fury. The hard silicious varnish with which the face of the tablet was coated still remains in many parts entire; and the greater part of the carved writing is as clear and legible now as when the monument was first erected.

The monument consists partly of figures in relief, partly of inscriptions. Our description will be drawn from the large lithograph given in the tenth volume of the *Asiatic Journal*. In the central and best seen part of the slab are figured the triumphs of Darius. The king, who is known by his diadem, by his loftier stature and grander person, as well as by the two attendants at his back who bear a bow and a lance, is seen trampling upon a prostrate figure, which raises its hands deprecatingly. The king holds a bow in his left hand, and raises his right in an attitude of superiority. Before him appear, in a long line, nine other figures of smaller and meaner stature. These are evidently prisoners, for they are fastened together by a rope, which passes from neck to neck. Apparently the humiliation of the captive under the feet of the king is the text of warnings addressed to those who stand before him. Over head hovers the winged Ormazd, begirt with the mysterious symbolical circle. The inscriptions, which are in numerous columns and tables, are chiefly below the sculpture; but separate small tablets are carved by the side of particular figures, which give fuller and more exact details.

We copy from Mr. Rawlinson some of the more important paragraphs as explanatory of the *tableau* we have described, and preparatory to a discussion of one or two points in the history which forms the subject of them:—

Col. i., par. 1. ‘I am Darius, the great king, the king of kings, the king of Persia, the king of the (dependent) provinces, the son of Hystaspes, the grandson of Arsames, the Achæmenian.

Par. 5. ‘Says Darius the king:—By the grace of Ormazd I am king; Ormazd has granted me this empire.

Par. 10. ‘Says Darius the king:—This (is) what (was) done by me after that I became king. (A man) named Cambyeses, son of Cyrus, of our race, he was here king before me. Of that Cambyeses (there was) a brother, Bardes was his name; of the same mother, and of the same father with Cambyeses. Afterwards Cambyeses slew that Bardes. When Cambyeses had slain Bardes, it was not known to the people that Bardes had been slain. When Cambyeses had proceeded to Egypt,

then the State became wicked. Then the lie became abounding in the land, both in Persia, and in Media, and in the other provinces.

Par. 11. 'Says Darius the king :—Afterwards there was a (certain) man, a Magian, named Gomates. He arose from Pissiachada, the mountain named Aracadres, from thence. On the 14th day of the month Vayakna, then it was that he arose. He thus lied to the State :—'I am Bardes [Smerdis], the son of Cyrus, the brother of Cambyses.' Then the whole State became rebellious. From Cambyses it went over to him, both Persia, and Media, and the other provinces. He seized the empire. On the 9th day of the month Garmapada, then it was he so seized the empire. Afterwards Cambyses, unable to endure, (?) died.

Par. 12. 'Says Darius the king :—The empire of which Gomates the Magian dispossessed Cambyses, that empire from the olden time had been in our family. After Gomates the Magian had dispossessed Cambyses both of Persia and Media, and the dependent provinces, he did according to his desire : he became king.

Par. 13. 'Says Darius the king :—There was not a man, neither Persian nor Median, nor any one of our family, who would dispossess that Gomates the Magian of the crown. The State feared him exceedingly. He slew many people who had known the old Bardes ; for that reason he slew them, 'lest they should recognise me that I am not Bardes, the son of Cyrus.' No one dared to say anything concerning Gomates the Magian, until I arrived. Then I prayed to Ormazd ; Ormazd brought help to me. On the 10th day of the month Bagayadish, then it was, with my faithful men, I slew that Gomates the Magian, and those who were his chief followers. The fort named Sietachotes in the district of Media called Nisaea, there I slew him. I dispossessed him of the empire. By the grace of Ormazd I became king : Ormazd granted me the empire.

Par. 14. 'Says Darius the king :—The empire which had been taken away from our family, that I recovered. I established it in its place. As (it was) before, so I made it. The temples which Gomates the Magian had destroyed, I rebuilt. The sacred offices of the State, both the religious chaunts and the worship, (I restored) to the people, which Gomates the Magian had deprived them of. I established the State in its place, both Persia and Media, and the other provinces. As (it was) before, so I restored what had been taken away. By the grace of Ormazd I did (this). I arranged so that I established our family in its place. As (it was) before, so I arranged (it), by the grace of Ormazd, so that Gomates should not supersede our family.

Col. iv., par. 18. Says Darius the king :—'These are the men who alone were there when I slew Gomates the Magian, who was called Bardes. These men laboured in my service ; (one) named Intaphernes, the son of Veisparez, a Persian ; (one) named Otanes, the son of Socris, a Persian ; (one) named Gobryas, the son of Mardonius, a Persian ; (one) named Hydarnes, the son of Megabignes, a Persian ; (one) named Megabyzus, the son of Dadois, a Persian ; (one) named Ardomanes, the son of Basuces, a Persian.



Col. ii., par. 2. 'Says Darius the king:—Whilst I was at Babylon, these (are) the countries which revolted against me: Persia, Susiana, Media, Assyria, Armenia, Parthia, Murgiana, Sattagydia, Sacia.'

The second and third columns are taken up with the history of these several rebellions. The fourth contains a summary of the whole.

Col. iv., par. 1. . . . . 'After that the kings rebelled against me, I fought nineteen battles. By the grace of Ormazd, I smote them, and took nine kings prisoners.' [The names, &c., then follow.]

Par. 3. 'Says Darius the king:—These nine kings have I taken in these battles.

Par. 5. 'Says Darius the king:—These are the provinces which rebelled. The god Ormazd created lies that they should deceive the people. Afterwards the god Ormazd gave the people into my hand. As I desired, so the god Ormazd did' (?).

Most of our readers will be familiar with the story of the pseudo-Smerdis (or 'Bardes') as told by Herodotus. The self-overreaching suspicion and cruelty of Cambyses, who, to ensure his throne, puts to death his own brother Smerdis at the warning of a dream, and then finds another Smerdis taking possession of it: the death of the king by an accident, which looks like retribution, while on his march against the usurper; the conspiracy of the seven Persian nobles, and their attack upon the Magian in his palace; all these circumstances are given with the vividness and dramatic power of which Herodotus was master. But what was the real nature of the events which are clothed with the somewhat highly-coloured drapery of the historian? Was it a matter of mere personal ambition, or were there certain more important issues at stake, which the writer, interested in the story rather than concerned about its real significance, to some extent lost sight of? Niebuhr, Heeren, Grote, and, in fact, recent historical writers and scholars generally, have come to the conclusion, not a little supported by expressions employed by Herodotus himself, that the usurpation of Smerdis was nothing else than a great national movement; that it was, in short, the temporarily successful attempt of the Medes—for it will be remembered the Magi were a Median tribe—to recover that position of supremacy from which they had been displaced by Cyrus. It will be sufficient to quote the words of Mr. Grote. 'When we 'put together,' he writes, 'all the incidental notices which he (Herodotus) lets drop, it will be found that the change of sceptre 'from Smerdis to Darius was a far larger event than his direct 'narrative would seem to announce. Smerdis represents preponderance to the Medes over the Persians, and comparative

'degradation of the latter, who by the installation of Darius are again placed in the ascendant.' (*History of Greece*, vol. iv. p. 303.) The view expressed in Mr. Grote's words has become the generally received one amongst scholars. Mr. Rawlinson, on the strength of his documentary evidence, professes to set it aside, and to prove the ancient historian, no less than those who have followed his suggestions, to be decidedly in error. Agreeing to a large extent with Mr. Rawlinson in the view which he adopts, we yet hope to be able to do something towards vindicating Herodotus.

The general agreement between the narrative of the inscription and that of Herodotus, is remarkable. Even the names of the conspirators are accurately given, with one exception—Aspathines appearing in the place of Ardomanes. And if Darius takes to himself rather more of the credit of the enterprise than is conceded to him by the historian, that is nothing more than might have been expected from the nature of the monument. Even in Herodotus, Darius is described as acting on his own suggestion equally with Otanes. These two alone are principals in the plot, and it is to the decision and energy of the son of Hystaspes that its success is due. Herodotus appears to have been misinformed as to the real name of the usurper, which he says, was Smerdis. He also places the murder of Smerdis, brother of Cambyses, after, instead of before, the departure of Cambyses for Egypt. With these and a few other exceptions, the story of Herodotus agrees closely with the sculptured record. Of course we set aside those confidential interviews between Otanes and his daughter, and that famous conference between the seven conspirators after they had effected their purpose, which, in spite of the protestations of Herodotus, we cannot help regarding with some suspicion.

But here, in the inscription, is no hint of a revolution in favour of the Medes. Gomates is called simply a Magian, not a Mede. His temporary success is owing entirely to the fact that he was believed to be the son of Cyrus. Persia and Media are alike deceived, and the king, in retrospect, as Mr. Rawlinson remarks, expresses equal astonishment at the apathy of Mede and of Persian. 'There was not a man, neither Persian nor Median . . . who would dispossess that Gomates the Magian of the crown.' What is more, in a paragraph of the second column, an explicit account is given of a later revolt of the Medes under Phraortes. Let us then endeavour to see, not what inferences have been drawn from the words of Herodotus, but what it is, precisely, that he has said, and whether or no there is any real conflict between his statements on this head and the

inscription. The chief passages on which emphasis has been laid, are the following. On his death-bed, Cambyses, after exposing the imposture of the pseudo-Smerdis, conjures the Persian nobles 'not quietly to look on and see the sovereignty pass into the hands of the Medes.' (iii. 65.) Gobryas, one of the seven conspirators, expresses his indignation at being 'under a Mede and a Magian, one, moreover, who was without ears' (ib. 73); and, which is perhaps the strongest passage of all, Orctes satrap of Lydia is declared to have 'rendered no service to the Persians when they were deprived of the supremacy by the Medes.' (ib. 126.)\* Unquestionably these expressions suggest the idea of a national revolution. But we certainly owe it to Herodotus to put that construction upon his words which is most in agreement with what we learn from other authentic sources; and least of all are we warranted in framing upon the narrow basis of expressions 'incidentally dropped,' a theory which brings him into direct collision with those sources. Now it is remarkable, that of the three passages we have quoted, two occur in the course of those lively dramatic scenes of which Herodotus is so fond, and which, palpably, are the drapery, rather than the substance, of his story. In both cases the words give point to the expression of indignant feeling. Cambyses would make his Persian courtiers feel that the humiliation is theirs, equally with his own; and Darius, a Persian of the purest birth, sees in the elevation of a Magian Mede a positive national degradation. In the third passage the writer is referring to what he has already described, and may therefore be excused in speaking somewhat loosely; but he can scarcely intend, in a passing allusion, to present an entirely different view of the same event. We are then thrown back upon the main body of his story, and in that we find no more traces of a Median revolution than in the language of the inscription. All that is needful to bring the two authorities into harmony, will be to interpret the above-quoted expressions in the light of the more explicit narrative, instead of the latter by the former. Herodotus, we think, might very well speak of the usurpation of the pseudo-Smerdis as a wresting of supremacy from the Persians, and yet mean nothing more by the statement than that the crown had passed into the hands of a Mede, especially when the king was a *bonâ fide* autocrat, and not a mere representative ruler.

\* It seems extremely probable that the neutrality of the powerful satrap of Lydia is rather to be referred to the time of the revolt of the Medes alluded to by Herodotus (i. 130), and fully described in the second column of the inscription. The sagacity of Mr. Grote's criticism of the above passage is strikingly brought out by comparison with the evidence of the monument.

Mr. Grote's language calls for a further word of remark. He speaks of 'the incidental notices which Herodotus has let drop,' and seems to attach more importance to such notices than to the main narrative. We are unable to see the propriety of this. When a man has something to conceal, such hints by the way, and when he is off his guard, are extremely valuable, and are apt to contain more of truth than his direct assertions; but it is otherwise when we are dealing with a truthful, candid, witness, such as we believe Herodotus to be. In the latter case, the main tenor of the evidence is far more reliable than an incidental and perhaps inconsistent remark. Even the most cautious of men are occasionally surprised into an inaccuracy, or an inconsistency; and the unguarded statement is simply set aside by the more deliberate one. There is, indeed, one other case in which such incidental words, even of honest men, may have a value beyond that of their more explicit statements. It is when they describe what they imperfectly understand, and are only able to apprehend in fragmentary detail. Thus, for example, when Herodotus, in giving an account of the alleged circumnavigation of Africa by the Phœnicians, tells us the explorers affirmed that in rounding the continent they 'had the sun on their right hand,' this very particular which, to him, seemed so incredible,\* is to us one of the chief reasons for regarding the entire history as authentic; since in the infancy of astronomy and navigation, it could scarcely have been anticipated and invented. But neither is the former nor the latter case that of Herodotus. He was certainly honest, and except when it seemed to him desirable to throw a veil over some religious secret, he tells us all he knows. Nor is he quoting documents or employing terms which may have a fuller significance for us than for himself. Such being the case we are not justified in looking for a deeper meaning to his words than they carry on the face of them, or than a comprehensive view of all that he has written upon the same subject justifies us in assigning to them.

Mr. Rawlinson abandons Herodotus here, as hopelessly in error. We trust that what we have said will be regarded as a sufficient vindication of him. With regard to his other inaccuracies, we would only say that they are comparatively unimportant, and such as a narrator might easily fall into who was dependent for his facts chiefly, or largely, upon verbal information. 'The full value and extent of our author's correctness,' says Mr. Rawlinson, 'is best estimated by contrast with the writer, who, 'having had every opportunity of gaining exact information

\* *ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ, ἀλλὰ δὲ δὴ τεω.* . . . (iv. 42.)

'professed to correct the errors of one whom he did not scruple to call 'a lying chronicler.' Ctesias names the brother of Cambyses, Tanyoxarces; does not allow that Cambyses went into Egypt;\* makes him die at Babylon of an accidental hurt which he had given himself; places the Magian revolution after his death; corrupts the names of two out of six conspirators, and entirely changes the names of the other four,' &c. (vol. i. p. 69, n.)

What *was*, then, the real nature of the revolution? We have seen reasons for rejecting one hypothesis; is there any other to take its place, or is it to be regarded as a purely personal affair,—the elevation of an ambitious pretender to the throne? Mr. Rawlinson has the additional merit of seeing clearly that the language of the inscription points to something more than this. On a perusal of the words of this part of the inscription, one is struck with the prominence assigned in it to religion. In the histories subsequently given of the wars with Median, Persian, Armenian, and other rebellious princes, this feature is much less prominent. The grace of Ormazd is acknowledged; Ormazd 'brings help' to the king; 'by the grace of Ormazd' his army is declared to have defeated the rebel army: this is all. In the record of the destruction of Gomates, on the other hand, the allusions to religion are special and repeated. Not only does the king make acknowledgment that 'by the grace of Ormazd he holds his empire,' but we have such statements as the following:—'When Cambyses had proceeded to Egypt, then the state 'became wicked; then the lie became abounding in the land, 'both in Persia and in Media, and in the other provinces.' . . . 'Then I prayed to Ormazd; Ormazd brought help to me,' &c. . . . 'The temples which Gomates the Magian had destroyed, I rebuilt,' &c. (See *Inscr.* col. i. par. 14, as before quoted.)

Here, urges Mr. Rawlinson, with great force, we have all the traces not of a political, but a religious revolution. Gomates is a Magian priest—a member of one of the six Median tribes, it is true, but a man in whom the sacerdotal is naturally more prominent than the strictly national. He is ambitious, but not merely of personal aggrandizement; he endeavours to introduce throughout the empire what the inscription calls 'a lie,' a system of heretical religious worship; and that, doubtless, the system to which, as priest, he was specially devoted. In pursuance of this object he abolishes religious offices, and demolishes temples, and seems to find throughout the empire a considerable readiness of response to his schemes of innovation. Darius, the faithful

worshipper of Ormazd, vindicates the orthodox faith of the Achæmenidæ, slays the heretic usurper, and restores the institutions of worship to the state in which they were before.

A further question thus arises: what was the orthodox faith of the ancient Persians, and what was the heresy which the Magian usurper sought to introduce? We shall endeavour to see what means we have of answering it. On even a cursory view of the ancient religious system of Persia we are struck with elements of confusion. On the one hand we have the testimony of Herodotus to the effect that the Persians were simple nature-worshippers. 'They hold it lawful,' he writes, 'to set up no images, temples, or altars, and charge those who do so with folly. I suppose, because they do not conceive of the gods as possessing a human nature, in the manner of the Greeks. It is their custom to ascend the loftiest peaks of mountains, and there offer sacrifice to Zeus, calling by that name the entire circle of heaven. They sacrifice also to the sun and moon, earth, fire, and water.' (*Herod.* i. 131.) (By Zeus, of course he means the Persian equivalent for the Greek conception of that deity.) And very much in keeping with this account we have the well-known features of the fire-worship of the Parsees and Ghebers, perpetuated in spite of fierce persecution from the Moslems to the present day. On the other hand, we have the clearly-defined Dualism of Ormazd and Ahriman, the antagonistic powers of good and evil, which in a manner divide the universe between them—a system the very antithesis of the former. How is this anomaly to be explained? Mr. Rawlinson's theory is this—the former element, the elemental Pantheism, is Magism; the latter, the Dualistic system, is the legitimate Persian creed. On first entering the countries south of the Caspian, the Arian Medes and Persians would find them in the occupation of a non-Arian, probably a Turanian or Scythic people. They would bring with them from their former seats their national faith, and that, according to the sacred books of the Zendavesta, was based on a recognition of antagonistic powers; the one, Ormazd, to be served and honoured; the other, Ahriman, to be hated and warred against. On the other hand, the Turanian people subdued and disinherited by them, would, in all probability, be living in the exercise of some form or other of that nature-worship which seems so largely to have prevailed throughout central Asia. Here, then, we have the two elements side by side, ready either to struggle till the weaker should be vanquished, or to coalesce into some compromise between the two. The former might, at first sight, appear the more probable issue; but the Persians, we are informed by Herodotus (*Herod.* i. 135) were a

people unusually disposed to adopt the manners and customs of other nations. Their own creed would be in a rude and elementary form, whereas that of their subjects probably had attained to a more systematic development. The intellectually stronger, favoured by a national predisposition, gains the upper hand, and Turanian, *i.e.*, Magian, creed and formulary are engrafted upon the heterogeneous stock of Arian Dualism.\* Darius is a zealous champion of orthodoxy, who, for a time, rolls back the tide of religious corruption.

It will be generally agreed that the hypothesis we have just stated is extremely plausible; it remains to be seen whether more than this may be said of it. Mr. Rawlinson considers that he has established it as fact. Some of his statements, however, appear to us to need much qualifying. Thus, he has little more than probability in favour of his theory, that the Magians were a Scythic or Turanian tribe, incorporated with their conquerors, the Arian Medes; yet without it his case breaks down in an important point. Herodotus simply puts them down as one of the six Median tribes (*Herod.* i. 101); and according to Professor Wilson, 'the Magas (Magi) are recognised in the Puranas, 'as a caste of Brahmans, and as the privileged priests of the 'temple of the sun at Multan.' (*Journal of R. A. S.*, vol. xiii. p. 203.) While Mr. Rawlinson's argument to prove them non-Arian and Scythic is too subtle, and consists of too many links to admit of much dependence being placed upon it. 'They must have been Turanians, or Scyths;' this is the gist of the reasoning, 'because their religious worship, as inferred from the Behistun record, and the testimony of Herodotus, is inconsistent with the supposition that they belonged to either of the other two great families then occupying central and western Asia, the Arians and the Shemites.' (vol. i. 429.) But Herodotus bears no testimony to a Magian as distinct from a Persian worship; and the evidence of the inscription is entirely negative. For aught we learn from the latter document, Gomates might have been as much of a Dualist as Darius. No religious system has been so fraught with the elements of heresy as Dualism; witness the Valentinians, the Ophites, the Sabæans, the Manichæans, and numerous other heresies, which disfigured the simplicity of the Christian faith in the early ages of the Church. And we know perfectly well that, among the disciples of Zoroaster, the relation of Ahriman to Ormazd has been a fruitful source of division. There is, indeed, one part of the inscription which, if we could rely upon the translation—here somewhat doubtful unfortunately

\* Colonel Rawlinson's hypothesis was, we believe, first propounded in a paper published in vol. xv. of the *Journal of the R. A. S.* for the year 1855.

—would seem to favour Colonel Rawlinson's hypothesis. According to his version of col. i. par. 14, the Magian is declared to have destroyed temples, and abolished certain chaunts and forms of worship. Now it will be remembered that, according to the testimony of Herodotus, the Persians had no temples, and looked with contempt on certain expressions of devotion. This seems to favour the opinion that the worship which the historian was then describing was the Magian rather than the strictly Persian element of their religious system. Still the iconoclastic spirit may, for aught we know, have originally belonged to Dualism no less. The corruption of an imageless to an idolatrous worship is a phenomenon of which there are many examples in history; and the Magian would probably preface his demolitions by parading his zeal for the purity of worship.

And not only is Magism undetermined by this famous document, but it is equally free from any traces of a Dualistic theosophy. Mr. G. Rawlinson was under a different impression when the above theory was framed. He tells us no less than three times that the language of the inscription makes explicit reference to a power of evil. (See vol. i. p. 553; and vol. ii. pp. 427, 428.) This he subsequently ascertained to be an error. 'The Babylonian version,' he tells us, in a foot-note to page 610 of the second volume, apparently without observing the discrepancy, 'proves beyond dispute that the allusion is to Ormazd, as usual.' We are quite willing to concede that no argument is to be drawn from this silence. The scrupulous Persian would very likely shrink from naming expressly the Evil Being, from a feeling akin to that which prompted the Greeks to call the odious furies, 'the gracious ones,' and their left hand the 'well-named.' And moreover, the writings of the Zendavesta, by some ascribed to this period, though without sufficient certainty perhaps, contain ample evidence as to what became the distinguishing feature of the religious system of the Persians. Only this deserves to be noted, that the language of the inscription gives us no clue, in this particular, as to what the nature of the heresy of Gomates was. Moreover, it seems to us improbable that this Manichæan theory,—as we may by anticipation call it,—had distinctly enunciated itself at the early age to which Mr. Rawlinson refers it. The writings of the Zendavesta, which Colonel Rawlinson holds to be considerably more modern than the cuneiform documents, cannot be conclusive on this point, for they would be likely to interpret the previous history of the nation in the light of its later and more systematized creed. The language of Darius in the inscription is that of a man who believes his deity to be supreme and omnipotent, able to bestow victory when and



where he will, rather than one fettered by the opposition and counteraction of an evil Being well nigh as mighty. This doctrine of two antagonistic personalities dividing between them the universe, seems to be one which only gradually develops itself in the human mind. It is one of the many ways in which man attempts to solve a problem too vast for him; the reconciliation of the existence of evil with the providence of a God infinitely good and wise. When first rising upon the horizon of thought it would be dim and ill-defined. There would be the presentiment of a form, as in our great poet's conception of Death:—

‘ what seemed his head  
The likeness of a kingly crown had on.’

But there would be none of that systematic and symmetrical development of the doctrine which characterizes the later and full-grown Persian system, even when, according to Mr. Rawlinson, Magism had completely obtained the ascendancy over it. Such a vague, shadowy Dualism, we are willing to admit, the Arians may have ‘brought with them from beyond the Indus,’ but nothing more than this, we imagine. The name Bagistanus—‘place of Baga’—clearly points to the worship of a sun-deity, identical with the Sanscrit Bhaga—a name which, as has been shown by Dr. Donaldson, in an article in the *Edinburgh Review*, is the origin of the Slavonic word for God, *Bog*, and appears both in the Vedas and the Zendavesta, as a general term for deity. (*Edinburgh Review*, No. 192, Art. 1.) The reader will remember the statement of Professor Wilson, to which reference has been made, according to which the Magi appear as priests of the sun at Moultan. The apportionment of the two conflicting elements of Dualism and Nature-worship, seems to us, indeed, rather more difficult than Mr. Rawlinson would represent. We should be disposed to put a very emphatic note of uncertainty to such a statement as the following:—‘But Magism was, as has been already shown, the old Scythic religion (*i. e.*, Nature-worship) and was professed wherever there was a Scythic population.’—Vol. ii. p. 552.

We must confess to having undergone some fluctuation of opinion with regard to this part of Mr. or Colonel Rawlinson's hypothesis. Its extreme plausibility disposed us to accept it at first, with something of the interest which would naturally be felt in it by its propounder. But further consideration has not strengthened our confidence in it, at least, has not served to remove it for us from the domain of conjecture into that of history. This, however, scarcely detracts from our sense of the value of the researches made in connexion with it; and we have

no hesitation in expressing our conviction that the papers contained in these volumes bearing upon the usurpation of Smerdis alone would constitute them the most important historical contribution to the study of Herodotus which has been made for many years. The author has, we consider, entirely demolished the generally received theory of the national character of the revolution under the pseudo-Smerdis, and has shown strong reasons for believing it to have been religious rather than political. He has also done good service in discriminating between the two conflicting elements of the Persian religious system, even though we suspend our judgment as to the theory by which he would account for the amalgamation; and in the course of his investigations has thrown much light on other interesting related subjects.

The above observations have been extended to some length, from a sense of the interest which these papers of the author will be generally felt to possess; in dwelling upon them, we have indicated only one of the points upon which historical illustration has in these volumes been richly heaped, but which we are compelled for the present to pass by. Beside the introductory chapters on the life of Herodotus, his sources of material, and his features as a historian, constituting the best introduction to the author with which we are acquainted, we would call attention to the discussions upon Lydian, Median, and Assyrian history, with the chapter upon 'The Ethnic Affinities of the Nations of Western Asia,' as particularly interesting and valuable.

We have a few words to add as to the manner in which the body of the work, comprising the translation, is executed. On the whole, we are of opinion that he has acted wisely in giving a version rather than the original text. Of course, no one who can use the original will care to read a translation; but the Greek scholar is sure to have a copy of Herodotus on his shelves, and the familiar aspect of the English will tempt many to peruse the volumes who would regard the Greek text as a sort of warning to 'persons found trespassing.' Mr. Rawlinson lays claim to no higher merit for his rendering than that of 'exactness:' we may add that, while faithful to the sense, it is free from verbal servility, and will be found tolerably idiomatic and pleasant reading. It would be too much to expect the reproduction of all the quaintness and simplicity which charm us so much in the original. Perhaps a thoroughly good translation is impossible in the present day. As time drifts along, hurrying us into modes of thought and speech more and more markedly different from those of the old Greek, the task becomes increasingly hopeless. Hobbes has left us a translation of Thucydides,

which, though not so correct as better philological knowledge might have made it, is yet the most faithful reproduction we possess of the hard, austere, strength of the original. Daniel De Foe might perhaps have done the same service for Herodotus, or quaint old Fuller. The translations by Beloe and Littlebury are of little value; and that published by Mr. Bohm, while generally correct, is more fitted to be employed as a 'crib' than by an English reader. That of Mr. Isaac Taylor is perhaps less known than it deserves to be. While preserving much of the simplicity of the original, it is free from the stiffness which is apt to make translations cramped and unreadable. But it is often inaccurate, and not unfrequently fails to catch that graphic picturesqueness which is such a capital feature of Herodotus. Mr. Taylor evidently understands the duty of a translator. 'Loose and 'paraphrastic renderings,' he says in his preface, 'I discard; and would rather sometimes seem uncouth, than not retain the "significant turns and phrases of my author. Indeed, the analogies between the Greek and English languages are so many and striking, that they often invite an absolutely literal rendering.' But from a trial of the labour involved, we can well understand that the patience should often fail and the hand tire in executing the translation of a lengthened work like that of Herodotus on such principles as these; and Mr. Taylor is sometimes loose and paraphrastic in spite of himself. Mr. Rawlinson tells us, in his preface, that, had he been aware of the existence of Mr. Taylor's version at an earlier period, he would have 'been inclined, if permitted, with certain changes, to have adopted it.' Mr. Taylor has the advantage in the easy flow of his diction, but his successor is far more accurate.

Mr. Rawlinson occasionally gives to his renderings somewhat too modern a cast. Thus, for example, in Book i. 126, Cyrus is made to say to the assembled Persians, 'I feel that I am destined by Providence to undertake your liberation.' We fancy we hear the words of some modern revolutionary, except, perhaps, in the devout acknowledgment of Providence. Nor in this particular case is the fidelity of the translation more to be commended than the tone of it. Word for word the Greek is, 'For myself, methinks, I must have been by a divine chance born to take this business in hand.' A few lines lower down we have, 'as if God had deprived him of his senses.' This is to render the Greek *ὥστε θεοβλαβής εἶναι*. The expression is a difficult one we are quite willing to admit; but it would have been far better to have said with Mr. Taylor, 'as if *infatuated*;'—a word which is used by our best writers in the sense of Herodotus, and does not make the polytheistic writer recognise the existence of a One

Supreme. In the same paragraph ἐλευθεροῦντο is rendered, 'they shook off the yoke;' δεινὸν ποιούμενοι, 'impatient of;' ἑτελοκάκειον, 'they counterfeited fear;'—correctly enough, but with a lack of freshness and piquancy. In such expressions as the last—'they played the volunteer-coward,'—as we may venture to put it—Fuller would have felt himself at home.

We give the following passage as a fair specimen of Mr. Rawlinson's manner in dealing with continuous narrative. Unsuccessful in war against the Tegeans, the Spartans had sent to Delphi for counsel.

'The answer of the Pythoness was that, before they could prevail, they must remove to Sparta the bones of Orestes, the son of Agamemnon. Unable to discover his burial-place they sent a second time, and asked the god where the body of the hero had been laid. The following was the answer they received:—

'Level and smooth is the plain where Arcadian Tegea standeth; ·  
There two winds are ever, by strong necessity, blowing,  
Counter-stroke answers stroke, and evil lies upon evil.  
There all-teeming earth doth harbour the son of Atrides;  
Bring thou him to thy city, and then be Tegea's master.'

'After this reply the Lacedæmonians were no nearer discovering the burial-place than before, though they continued to search for it diligently; until at last a man named Lichas, one of the Spartans called Agathoergi, found it. The Agathoergi are citizens who have just served their time among the knights. The five eldest of the knights go out every year, and are bound during the year after their discharge to go wherever the State sends them, and actively employ themselves in its service.

'Lichas was one of this body when, partly by good luck, partly by his own wisdom, he discovered the burial-place. Intercourse between the two States existing just at this time, he went to Tegea, and, happening to enter into the workshop of a smith, he saw him forging some iron. As he stood marvelling at what he beheld, he was observed by the smith, who, leaving off his work, went up to him and said, 'Certainly, then, you Spartan stranger, you would have been wonderfully surprised if you had seen what I have, since you make a marvel even of the working of iron. I wanted to make myself a well in this room (Query, is this a fit translation of the word ἀδλῆ?), and began to dig it, when, what think you? I came upon a coffin seven cubits long. I had never believed that men were taller in the olden times than they are now, so I opened the coffin. The body inside was of the same length: I measured it, and filled up the hole again.'

'Such was the man's account of what he had seen. The other, on turning the matter over in his mind, conjectured that this was the body of Orestes, of which the oracle had spoken. He guessed so, because he observed that the smithy had two bellows, which he under-

stood to be the two winds, and the hammer and anvil would do for the stroke and the counter-stroke, and the iron that was being wrought for the evil lying upon evil. This he imagined because iron had been discovered to the hurt of man. Full of these conjectures, he sped back to Sparta and laid the whole matter before his countrymen. Soon after, by a concerted plan, they brought a charge against him, and began a prosecution. Lichas betook himself to Tegea, and on his arrival acquainted the smith with his misfortune, and proposed to rent his room of him. The smith refused for some time; but at last Lichas persuaded him, and took up his abode in it. Then he opened the grave, and collecting the bones, returned with them to Sparta. From henceforth, whenever the Spartans and the Tegeans made trial of each other's skill in arms, the Spartans always had greatly the advantage, and by the time to which we are now come they were masters of most of the Peloponnese.' (Vol. i. pp. 204 *sqq.*)

So far as we have examined Mr. Rawlinson's version, it generally makes good the claim to be considered 'exact.' Here and there, however, we have marked a blunder. To one of these we have already called attention (p. 461), while commenting upon Mr. Blakesley's edition. Another occurs in vol. i. p. 204. The Spartans, Herodotus tells us, had been led on by a lying oracle to make an attack upon Tegea, expecting after their victory to 'mete out for themselves with the measuring-line its goodly plain.' The oracle came true. The Spartans did 'mete out its goodly plain;' but in mockery, as captives, not conquerors. Mr. Rawlinson makes them to have been fastened together *by a string*. But the string is no other than the 'measuring-line' to which the bitter jest of the oracle made reference. One other error of rather a curious kind has caught our notice. Herodotus gives the following account of the manner in which the Arabians obtain the gum of the cistus (iii. 112): 'Ledanum, which the Arabians call Ladanum,' (our *laudanum*, though the name is applied to a very different substance,) 'is produced in a way still more marvellous. It grows in a most unsavoury place, and yet has itself a most delicious scent. It is found growing in the beards of he-goats, like gum from trees.' Mr. Rawlinson renders the last sentence, 'It is gathered from the beards of he-goats, where it is found sticking like gum, having come from the bushes on which they browse.' Here his translation is as wrong as his facts are right. The gum does 'come from the (cistus) bushes on which they browse;' but this is not what Herodotus says. He really thought the ledanum was an animal gum, and his astonishment was great at finding such 'Sabreau odours' proceeding from factor. With his translator, the mistake and the marvel disappear together. The story just

before told of the huge roc-like birds, whose nests were made of cinnamon-sticks, made pretty large demands upon the reader's credulity; yet paired with this strangely perverted account of the cistus-gum, one might well feel some such hesitation as to which was the greater wonder, as Sancho Panza tells us was felt by those who were canvassing the relative claims of the adventures of his master with the Windmills and the Fulling-mills. But as the translator tells the story, the palm is clearly wrongly awarded. It is indeed curious that Herodotus should not have been better informed about this gum. He is wrong in saying it was found in Arabia only. The cistus grew, and still grows on the Greek islands; and we are told that one of the methods of collecting it is to lash the foliage of the plant with a whip of small cords. The gum adheres to the cords, and is afterwards removed with the hand. (*Larcher*, ad l.).

But these seem to be isolated blemishes. Of course we cannot profess to have compared Mr. Rawlinson's version throughout with the Greek; but we have compared enough to convince us that the opinion we have expressed of its fidelity is fully borne out by its general character.

We welcome the appearance of such a work as this, not merely for the value of its contributions to our knowledge of antiquity, but because of the manner in which it is likely to interest in such studies those who from deficiency of early education feel themselves almost excluded from the authors designated, with a little too much of the spirit of exclusiveness, 'classical;' while at the same time the breadth of their general reading has convinced them that for better or for worse, our own culture is indissolubly linked with that ancient past, in which lie the springs of much of our moral and intellectual development, and whose languages constitute no despicable part of our inheritance as a nation. The best security for the down-breaking of the arbitrary barrier between classical and non-classical culture which has to so large an extent prevailed to the prejudice of both the one and the other, is to be found in the pervasion of the classical with that broader spirit which would assign to it its due place as a needful element in the studies of all who would so educate themselves as to be worthy of those intellectual riches which have been handed down to them from foregoing ages, and at the same time would rebuke that absurd quasi-aristocratical pretension which would assign to the learned in Latin and Greek, as such, the exclusive designation of *Scholar*.

- ART. VII.—(1.) *Letter to a Noble Lord on the Nature and Prospects of Political Party.* By a Commoner. London: Hatchard. 1858.
- (2.) *Phases in Politics.* By WILLIAM F. LENDRICK. Second Edition. London: T. and W. Boone. 1858.
- (3.) *Parliamentary Government considered with reference to a Reform of Parliament.* By EARL GREY. London: Bentley. 1858.

THERE is no fallacy so frequently exemplified in real life as that of attributing striking phenomena to some grand event by which they have been immediately preceded. The Reform Bill doubtless was a measure of the first magnitude. It opened the portals of the Senate to the trading and mercantile interests. It took away the franchise from a handful of aristocratic scrvlings, and bestowed it upon a crowd of honest artizans. It gave the masters of those artizans seats in the House of Commons. By its instrumentality the shopkeepers of a country town could frequently defeat the influence of a neighbouring magnate who was anxious to secure the constituency for his political nominee. Hence it has become the fashion lately to ascribe every novelty arising out of our parliamentary system, whether cognate to these changes or not, to the influence of the Reform measure of 1832. If the old political parties evince signs of dissolution, of course there can be no other reason for it than the Reform Bill. If ministers break up every two or three years and the legislative coach cannot go on, what other cause can be alleged for the inconvenience but the Reform Bill? The Liberal members have been strangely mutinous of late. In the spirit of the trite Horatian maxim, they pertinaciously refuse to swear allegiance to any master. This surely cannot be for want of leadership. There is the daring and chivalrous Russell, the wily and dexterous owner of Cambridge House, the ingenuous and impassioned Gladstone, and the plausible master of Netherby; none of whom, we believe, would refuse the dignity, if the power which it conferred should rest on a compact and united body. But the Liberal party has been spoiled by too much success. They have been surfeited with the sweets of office and have grown effeminate and rebellious. Their bankruptcy and defeat, in one word, has been caused by the very measure which should have fixed them in Downing-street for ever. So says Lord Grey, Mr. Lendrick, and two or three cotemporary Reviews; and we must confess it, as far as politics are concerned, to afford a very ingenious method of solving intricate questions. The reader, instead of involving himself in a vast expenditure of thought, and wading through

innumerable pages of Hansard and of Cobbett's *Parliamentary Register*, need only single out some half-dozen of the most striking legislative changes in our history, and ascribe every political event to them in the order of sequence. Indeed, we see no reason that he should stop here. Why not, like Pythagoras, take a few simple propositions and evolve out of them all the phenomena of the universe. It would save a wonderful deal of trouble and dispense at a stroke with all the libraries and scientific treatises in existence. In this case he would not lack right, reverend and even most reverend authority. Archbishop McHale is attributing the potato blight in Ireland to the efforts of the Government to provide something like classical education for the people of that country; and the Bishop of Norwich, in tracing the same phenomenon to the endowment of Maynooth, showed the variegated character of the causal relation, and enunciated a discovery which doubtless under an enlightened Government would at once have dissolved the Chemistry Commission.

As regards the matters under consideration, there is, however, one trifling obstacle to the admission of the theory of the gentlemen whose names are at the head of this article. The effects which they attribute to the Reform Bill were in existence long before the propounders of that measure were born. They were also in active operation on the eve of the Reform Bill's adoption by the high powers of Parliament. At the end of Lord Liverpool's administration, there was as much disunion in the Conservative camp as prevails among the Liberals at the present day. Canning had no option between abandoning the helm or obeying the curt advice which Walpole gave Pelham, viz., 'to Whig his administration.' The Marquis of Lansdowne and Mr. Huskisson being called in afforded to the veteran statesman some kind of guarantee for the support of the Liberal party, and indemnified him for the desertion in the ranks of his own. But Canning stood upon an isthmus, daily disappearing beneath the ever-vexed tides of advancing democracy and unyielding Toryism. The ground was not worth six months' purchase. Party ties were loosened for the support of an unstable position, and in the course of four years occurred as many weak administrations.

But if we would study the period when party disorganization was at its height, we must retrace our steps at least a century. We must fix our attention upon the epoch when Chatham's first administration was crowned by the reduction of Canada, by the establishment of our empire in India, and by the rapid victories of Hawke and Boscawen, who maintained in the Mediterranean



and along the northern shore of the Atlantic that supremacy which Clive and Wolfe had so gallantly gained for our arms in opposite quarters of the globe. The Jacobites were completely estranged from the Stuart interest by the connexion of the Pretender with Mrs. Walkinshaw, and by his ingratitude to Bolingbroke. The brilliant success which had united all parties as one man in support of Pitt's administration, was accompanied by the advent of a monarch who openly avowed his hostility to party connexion, and determined to rule irrespective of their influence. The descendants of the Tories of Queen Anne beheld with some regard an heir of the House of Brunswick who could speak the English language with some degree of propriety, and who was resolved to exert his prerogative. The descendants of the Whigs of William found themselves in the position which the Tories had abandoned, of churlish indifference to a sovereign who refused to intrust his sceptre in the hands of the great families to whose ancestors he was indebted for the crown which he wore. Each of the great factions in the State had forsaken their old principles without having settled the dogmas of their future political creed. It is remarkable that from the fall of Walpole to the accession of Lord North, a period extending over nearly thirty years, the Whigs had no political opponents but those which their own intrigues and dissensions flung into rebellion. Parties were distinguished, not by great principles or by the espousal of divergent opinions, but by the names of great families. It was Carteret against the Pelhams, or the House of Wentworth against that of Bedford, or Pitt and Temple, with their immediate connexions against the entire field. The contest, as far as great political doctrines were concerned, was as bootless as the contest of the green and blue factions in the Hippodrome of Constantinople, or as the dissensions between the Neri and Bianchi, the Uberti and Buondelmonti in the palmy days of Florence. So completely had petty family interests absorbed all the old associations arising out of identity of political sentiment that George III. constantly mistook one for the other. The blunt-minded king in praying to be delivered from party ties meant that he might not be sacrificed to the interest of one or two private connexions; and when he alludes in his notes to private connexions, he invariably showed by the context that he thought this was all that was intended by unions based upon political principle. This sovereign found himself in the position for which William III. so devoutly longed, without either Whigs or Tories, and surrounded by statesmen divided by no hostility of opinion; and he reaped the fruit of it by having no escape from the irritating lectures of the Grenvilles, except he was prepared

to endure either the lofty arrogance of Pitt or the pompous trifling of Rockingham. All the relief his Majesty had was in varying the nature of his misery and changing his tormentors. In the first ten years of his reign occur seven prime ministers; and there would have been twice seven had the monarch been so lucky as to have a successor at hand every time he felt disposed to turn out an administration. We are not, therefore, disposed to see anything so very novel in the present state of political disorganization as to set it down to the account of a modern enactment. Wherever there are no great constitutional or fiscal questions at issue, political opinions will always be vaguely defined, and when political opinions are vaguely defined, there will be a series of weak administrations. In this respect we certainly are not worse off than at many antecedent epochs in our history. During the last six years our ministries have been as short-lived as during the eventful six years which immediately succeeded the passing of the Reform Bill, and yet, taking each of these periods, we can count only four administrations. But between 1805 and 1810 we can count the same number, and in 1782-83 four succeeded each other in one year and seven months. During the first ten years of the present reign occur only three administrations. In the tenth year of George III.'s reign Lord North was the seventh Prime Minister. The average length of administrations, from the accession of the House of Brunswick to the passing of the Reform Bill, is one in every four years. Their duration from 1832 to the present time only differs from this by a very small fraction. The fact is, in comparing the present with the past in this respect, we labour under a double delusion. Of recent administrations the shortest make the most lively impression on account of the novelty and excitement they afford: while, in dealing with the past, the longest take possession of our memories to the exclusion of the rest. We dwell upon the successful tactics of Walpole and the lengthy premierships of Liverpool and Pitt, until we lose sight of the short administration of Shelburne, which must be counted by months; that of Portland, which must be reckoned by weeks; and that of Bath, which must be numbered by hours!

But, in reality, the present collapsed state of party in the House of Commons, with its concomitant attendant of weak ministries, may be traced to causes which have as little to do with the Reform Bill as with the quadrature of the circle; and these are so far from being recondite, that none but children should be excused for overlooking them. Previous to the flight of James II., England saw a great army abandoned by its officers, who went over in a body to lay their swords at the feet of the

General against whom they were commissioned to fight. About twelve years ago this country beheld the same desertion in the political world. A great chieftain, surrounded by his staff, left the political ranks he had so often led to victory, and deliberately gave his support to the enemy. The army he abandoned, unlike the one collected on Salisbury Plain, elected a new set of leaders, who carried on a more ruthless war with their late friends than with their old enemies. Though these attacks have been for some time suspended by the removal of the principal actor from the scene, the wounds inflicted are not yet cicatrized; and that little knot of chiefs still remains without followers; and the army which they abandoned is yet in the hands of leaders of doubtful faith or of questionable ability. The Whig chiefs, instead of availing themselves of the breach in the ranks of their opponents to secure their power, fell as usual into dissension; and that to such an extent as to allow themselves to be outwitted by a mutilated party which has its head in one place and its tail in another. Russell ejected Palmerston from power, who in turn did the same kind office for Russell; and when these gentlemen were again reinstated, their ultra followers stepped in to their extreme discomfiture, and settled some unpleasant accounts with both. That the quarrel of the two Whig leaders about the unauthorized recognition of Napoleon should be ascribed to the extension of the suffrage, and Sir Robert Peel's conversion on the Corn Laws should be set down to the disenfranchisement of boroughs in Schedule A, does appear to us one of the most extraordinary aberrations of the human intellect.

Though we are by no means inclined to short-lived ministries, we are not quite sure that more evil is not to be feared from those of a very durable character. Nearly every good measure which has received the sanction of the Legislature has been carried by administrations of four or five years' duration. Nearly every bad measure has been passed by administrations extending over twelve and eighteen years. Sir Robert Peel's last five years' administration repealed the Corn Laws. During Melbourne's six years' term of office the Municipal Act was passed; during the shorter ministerial tenure of Earl Grey the Indian trade was thrown open, the representation reformed, and the negro emancipated. The short-lived Wellington ministry gave us the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and the Roman Catholic Relief Bill. The brief ministries of Grenville and Rockingham abolished the slave trade, carried economical reform, and repealed the Stamp Act; and the five years and a half dictatorship of the first Pitt won for us our principal outlying dependencies, and made the power of Britain paramount in every quarter of the

globe; the second Pitt, North, and Walpole huddled all the little good they effected during their sixty-five years' tenure of Downing-street into one page, that page could not compete with the list which the brief administration of Earl Grey could furnish. To the first we owed a foreign policy which yoked this country to the wheel of Continental despotism, the tax on bread, the Alien Act, and the many dark bills of coercion necessitated by the spirit of rebellion which Lord Liverpool's Government provoked by its unrelenting opposition to every moderate plan of reform. To the second we owe four hundred millions of debt which purchased defeat abroad and commercial panics at home. To the third we owe the loss of our American colonies, and to the fourth the destruction of the Sinking Fund which in a few years would have swallowed up the debt, and a system of parliamentary corruption which has no parallel in the most venal of imperial senates, or in the most slavish junta of Asiatic despotism. The reason of all this appears to be sufficiently obvious. Governments which have a presentiment of being short-lived are generally too weak to carry an obnoxious series of measures. They generally lean on popular favour for support against the personal antipathy of the sovereign, or a strongly organized opposition in Parliament. They are also invariably anxious to leave something behind them which will urge the country to demand their recall. On the other hand, the most durable ministries have always commanded large majorities in both Houses, and there has been the completest harmony between their movements and the predilections of the sovereign. This is the only class of governments which can persist in a policy really mischievous and distasteful to the nation. Our cabinets are at present unknown to the law, but we see no reason why they should be so, since so much depends on their operation. Among other regulations we would have their sittings determined by statute, and their existence connected with some limit in point of time. The Executive of America is dissolved every four years. That of Sweden cannot last longer than three. The Executive of Rome in its palmyest days was confined to one year; while that of the old Florentine Republic was of still shorter duration. Why should not ours be turned adrift if they manifest a disposition to go over their eighth or tenth year? Depend upon it governments lose nothing by the process of reconstruction. Like Antæus, from fresh contact with their mother earth, they derive renovated strength, and proceed on their course with new life and vigour. With no limit to their existence, they are too apt to wrench the representative machinery of the country to the fortification of their weakness, and to prolong their duration to a

corrupt and feeble dotage. Such was the Government of Pelham, of Walpole, of Lord North, of the younger Pitt, of the late Lord Liverpool. Such, doubtless, would have been the Government of Percival had he lived to consolidate it. While everything goes on in the beaten track, the power of a ministry to continue in office is generally in proportion to its duration. The bench becomes filled with their creatures; the Customs and Excise with their placemen; the Church with their nominees. By means of commissions and the lucrative offices connected with the education and police of the country, every servile tongue and unprincipled pen is at their disposition. The nation becomes packed with their agents, who act with the joint force of a disciplined body, and who raise their voice in exulting huzzas above the crowd, until their admiration is mistaken for that of an enthusiastic country. There is hardly a doubt, had it not been for the Spanish and American wars, that by means of such machinery as this Walpole and North, like Pelham, Liverpool, and Pitt, would have died at the head of their respective administrations. The nation, having experienced the evils that result from the prolonged administration of an unprincipled minister, backed by the prejudices of the sovereign and a corrupt parliamentary majority, would do well to guard against a recurrence of the mischief. What we want is neither very weak nor very strong administrations, but those only of medium strength: such as have sufficient force to endure as long as they pursue a right course, and which are easily overset when they move in a wrong direction. Cabinets of ten years' growth, under chiefs tenacious of political power, have in general proved too strong for the country.

The only instrument the people possess for keeping the executive in check, is a compact and well organized opposition. The frequent election of Parliaments avail nothing to this end, if the members act without concerted effort, and as their individual volitions prompt. For the Government and its supporters being always a well knit body, act with disciplined force and united energy. If a mob of isolated senators attempt to arrest the progress of an administration, unless their numerical force be positively overwhelming, their disconnected efforts are likely to prove as unavailing as those of the rabble when they attempt to interfere with the march of a well serried body of infantry. But a well organised opposition is not always at hand. It has failed the nation at some antecedent periods of its history for a protracted period. It is wanting at the present moment, and if the tendency to senatorial dislocation which now prevails be not checked, it is likely to be wanting for some time to come.

There appears to be a growing disposition in the country to regard those members of Parliament who refuse to be trammelled by party ties as the only incorruptible patriots, and to look upon the rest as lawyers speaking from a brief. When a speaker rises below the gangway, so conscious is he of this feeling, that the first thing he does to gain the favour of his hearers is to assure them he sits without collusion with any party in the House, and speaks solely under the pressure of his unbiassed convictions. This is quietly done with the air of a man who is clearing himself from dishonest imputations. Such sentiments, and the feelings to which they appeal, appear to us to arise out of a mistaken idea of the functions of legislators. These are not simply to criticise measures like editors of newspapers, to point out what is evil, and to defend what is good, but to take such steps as shall lead to the defeat of the one and the adoption of the other. This can only be effected by referring particular measures to general principles, and acting in concert with those who have adopted that line of policy which those general principles point out. Neutral senators either do not know their trade, or knowing their trade, lack the capacity to carry it out.

By the nature of the case, so long as we uphold the constitutional doctrine of the responsibility of cabinets *in solidum*, there must always be a strong body of senators regularly disciplined and bound in frank pledge to each other for the purpose of carrying the measures of the minister. Under the present system, as long as self-interest, or private attachment, has any influence over men's minds, this body must of necessity exist at all times. The question, then, about the expediency of party, is not whether such unions shall exist, but whether we shall suffer them to be all on one side, and not adopt the same species of combination for exercising an efficient control over Governments which they have recourse to for the preservation of their power. If there is to be no party organization on the left of the Speaker's chair, it is surely fair there should be none on the right. If the benches opposite the treasury be filled with a fortuitous concourse of senators, it is right that those behind the treasury should be equally free from party distinction.

To effect this purpose we are invited\* to break up the present homogeneous structure of cabinets; to choose ministers irrespective of party ties, and render each supreme in his own department, without any controlling agency but such as is interposed by the Parliament or the sovereign. Our reply to this scheme is, that it is inadequate, and even were it adequate, that it is

\* Homerson Cox, *British Commonwealth*, p. 41. *North British Review*, No. XLVII., p. 183.

nothing else than asking us to undo all the progress that legislation has made for the last one hundred and fifty years, and to return to the régime of the Stuarts. Instead of this plan being adequate to extinguish party, it was not even competent to prevent its growth. It was in operation when Titus Oates nicknamed the cavaliers Tories, from the Irish witnesses they produced to gainsay his assertions. It was in operation when the exclusionists were denominated Whigs, from the church marauders in Scotland. This notable scheme which is to extinguish all party feud, was actually carried out to supreme perfection at a time when the present party divisions raged at their height; when Whig and Tory furnished not merely nominal watchwords but political creeds; when they split not only the legislature but the council chamber into hostile camps; when they turned the church against the throne, and even transformed courtiers into revolutionists. No one can attribute to Charles II. any fastidious taste or bigoted exclusiveness in the selection of his ministers. He admitted into his councils men of all shades of opinions, from the most inveterate Hobbist to the most constitutional stickler for the rights of the people. And what was the consequence? Their official lives were spent in a succession of plots and intrigues against each other. The Secretary of State for the north was generally employed in hunting his brother of the south to the scaffold; while the head of the treasury was bent on driving the keeper of the Great Seal into exile. Each party in the Privy Council had ordinarily a strong following in the lower House as sedulously bent upon attaining their objects as if their own salvation depended on the result. Danby impeached Winnington, Coventry demanded the head of Clarendon, and Rochester had set his heart upon the attainder of Shaftesbury. The ancients, we are told, who found themselves in civil function during the same administration were under the tie of *necessitudo satis*, bound to regard each other as united by links of private friendship. The moderns seem to have inverted this rule, and to have regarded the connexion as a reason for harbouring the most deadly hostility. The more liberal the election of the sovereign, or in other words, the greater the divergence of opinion between the advisers whom he selected, the greater proved the dissension; and the greater the dissension the more perfectly was this notable scheme carried into practice. If we wanted to provide a plan for exciting the acrimony of party to the greatest pitch, commend us to this very scheme proposed for its extinction.

Historical precedents conveying the same lessons may also be derived from epochs subsequent to the revolution. William III.,

like his regal predecessors, summoned to his cabinets the representatives of the leading factions of the State, without any regard to their party ties or private connexions. Chatham formed his last administration on the same principles. But these administrations, if they did not increase party ties certainly did not diminish them; while they introduced dissensions into the councils of the empire, and weakened the force of the national will. Was Nottingham less a Tory by sitting at the side of Sunderland? or Shrewsbury less a Whig because in the same council chamber as Bolingbroke? or were the factions which these chiefs led less assiduous in plotting against their rivals, and keeping up their respective organizations, simply because their leaders sat in the same cabinet? We know the contrary. We know that the very fact of bringing the discordant chiefs face to face, and confining their consultations to the limits of the same council chamber, only served to enkindle their animosity and increase the activity of their respective tails; that the holding the two powers in an equipoise only led each party to redouble its exertions with a view to turn the doubtful balance in its favour. We know that William, harassed by their subterranean intrigues and frequent misrepresentations, told Bentinck to have his yacht in readiness that he might seek shelter in Holland from the distracted councils of political chiefs, who seemed to have no other object than that of worrying each other to death. Nor can we wonder at such a resolution. William was at the head of the Executive, and to a great degree identified with its acts. How could he, with any degree of dignity, allow Nottingham to attach his name to measures in the north, every one of which was expressly contradicted by the opposite policy carried out by Shrewsbury in the south? With what propriety could he permit those principles of liberty for the preservation of which he was continually exposing his own life in foreign conflict, to be held up for banter by his minister at home? How could he, with any sense of delicacy, have allowed the treasurer of the navy to controvert in the Commons whatever the White Staff advanced in the Lords? Yet such was his position with regard to those administrations he avowedly formed for the purpose of breaking up party in this country. If William, who was no party man, but who spent the best part of his English life in struggling against party, was obliged to adopt the advice of Sunderland, and by throwing in his lot with the Whigs make the first stride towards the homogeneous structure and united responsibility of cabinets, in order to restrain party combination within due bounds, we may fairly regard his conduct as decisive upon the point in question. Surely we cannot demur



to the inference, that to return to the system which he abandoned for the purpose of mitigating party fury, is to take the step which is, above all others, most likely to increase it, and to exchange executive consistency for ruin to the empire.

But if any one feels inclined to study the working of a cabinet formed irrespective of party ties, he must direct his attention to the administration of Chatham. That administration was doubtless formed to gratify the king's desire of obliterating private connexion, and of having a Government based upon a union of all parties. The political world was to shame the religious: everything in that sphere was to be harmony, concord, paternity, universal attachment, and love. At the same board were to meet monarchists and republicans; Whig sinecurists and Whig patriots; Tories and Jacobites; the private friends of Lord Bute and the followers of the great Earl himself. The Tory North became Paymaster of the Forces: the Whig Camden took the Great Seal: Grafton, the enemy of Shelburne, headed the Treasury; and Shelburne, the enemy of Grafton, became Secretary for the Northern Department: the volatile Townshend was Chancellor of the Exchequer: the saturnine Gower was Lord President of the Council: Sandwich, who could not work a sum in arithmetic, headed the Board of Trade. The king had now what he called a fixed Government. His cousin of Prussia having given expression to some fears at the rapid succession of English ministries—'Good God!' exclaimed George, 'he is right; but there shall be no more changes. Rockingham's was 'the last.' Yet this redoubtable Government proved weaker than that of Wilmington or of Richard Cromwell. Though there was no opposition, it could not go on. The speeches of the Lords of the Treasury were generally answered by the two Secretaries of State. Grafton defeated every proposition of Shelburne's, and Camden frequently denounced the proceedings of both. Even Townshend carried his American import duties in the face of the opposition of his colleagues, who wanted to get rid of him, but were not sufficiently united to effect their purpose. The position of the cabinet was like that of the Pretender's army at Derby: while the left wing was concerting an attack on the extreme right, the left-centre bore down in great force on the entire body. The followers of Chatham overthrew the detachment of Rockingham, and were in turn overborne by the friends of Lord Bute. From such a concourse of repellant atoms arose a chaos something worse than what we read of in the Book of Genesis. The sailors mutinied: the soldiers rebelled. There were riots in London, and the leading provincial towns. The tanners of Cornwall, and the colliers of Newcastle, feeling

there was no government, threatened to march on London. Even the Body of tailors could not be kept down. They collected in Westminster, and were strong enough to suspend the sittings of a divided legislature. Confusion at home generated a worse state of things abroad. The colonies revolted. England's control over continental politics being destroyed by internal dissension, the despots of Europe were not slow to avail themselves of the opportunity. France made her influence paramount in Sardinia, and seized Corsica. Russia besieged Lemnos, and blockaded the Dardanelles. In the bay of Tchesme, the Turkish fleet met with that fate at the hands of the Russians they experienced in our day at Sinope. Then was laid that mischievous train of circumstances which resulted, during the next age, in the partition of Poland, and the French Revolution. Now these disasters were not owing to the agents, but to the system. Every man at the helm was in the possession of decent abilities: some were endowed with powers of marvellous excellence; but what other result but administrative incompetency and national disorganization could be expected from a system which infused into the executive council all the acrimony and dissension of a political debate, and which made the consideration, not how the nation's business was to be carried on, but how they who ought to carry it on were to circumvent each other.

One of the advantages expected to accrue from a return to the old system of departmental government is an increase of the control exercised by the House of Commons over the Executive; and a contemporary reviewer, with amusing gravity, objects to the scheme on this ground.\* As the influence which the contemplated change would introduce would run exactly in the opposite direction, the statement only shows what a loose way of thinking sometimes prevails in connexion with political subjects. The House of Commons at present, by one adverse vote, can overturn an entire administration. Under the old system, that adverse vote could only displace a single member of the Government; and the king, by shuffling the cards, might continue his services in another department. The sovereign now, in empowering a statesman to form an administration, is in some measure compelled to accept the list of ministers drawn out at his dictation; and if the crown attempts to eject one or two of that close connexion, it generally succeeds in bringing the entire structure about its ears. Under the old system, all the ministers were the direct nominees of the crown; and could be individually displaced or retained at

\* *National Review*, No. XIII., p. 233.

its pleasure. Now the head of the Treasury speaks to the sovereign as the exponent of a united cabinet, and as the delegate of the majority of the representatives of the people. It is as if the voice of a nation was concentrated in the mouth of one man. Utterances of so momentous a character seldom fail to coerce the understanding of the Sovereign into assent, even when most adverse to the policy of the ministry. Previous to the consolidation of the cabinet, no minister spoke in the closet with more influence than was derived from the simple functions of his office : when his views were unacceptable, he commonly had to make room for a successor. The history of the decline of the personal influence of the crown in the business of the country, and the control of the House of Commons over the Executive, is nothing else than the history of the transmutation of departmental government into that arising out of the solidarity of cabinets. Down to the accession of the House of Brunswick no cabinet was ever displaced by a vote of the House of Commons, nor was any cabinet ever cashiered at once. Even when the ejection of a party was sought, Queen Anne and William found it to their interest to proceed stealthily, and by the dismissal of one or two of the least powerful members, to prepare the way for the extinction of the rest. Cabinets were never dissolved, they were only remodified. By dealing singly with its ministers, the crown had all the power which the child had over the bundle of twigs when taken to pieces. When ministers were bound up together, it was powerless : as long as they were disunited, it could baffle the House of Commons by a change of men instead of a change of measures ; it could exercise its prerogative unfettered by any threat of ministerial secession, or by any ties of a party character. It could dictate its views to an isolated minister, and turn him into a mere registering-clerk of his own department. Instead of the first minister bringing the entire force of his cabinet to coerce the crown into his retention, the crown could draw the scattered members of his cabinet into a combination against a powerful minister. Indeed, one hundred and fifty years ago, such an amphibious creature as a prime minister could hardly be said to exist. All the powers which concentrate in him, and which, as ministerial attributes are unknown to, if they are not at open variance with, the theory of the constitution, even down to the days of Anne, were exercised by the sovereign. The king was the cap-stone of the ministerial arch : he alone could impart collective strength to the Executive, and reduce it again to the weakness of its individual elements. He filled up vacant appointments ; he made his arm felt at the antipodes. His levees were crowded, not by the loungers of the opera, or by the elegant triflers

of Almack's', but by ambitious divines, intriguing for stalls and mitres ; by eager diplomatists, jostling each other for place ; by officious statesmen, anxious to supplant their rivals in the affection of the sovereign. When George III., therefore, was bent upon resuming the powers held in abeyance during the reigns of his two German ancestors, and being a king somewhat in the Stuart fashion, his first step was to destroy party connexion, to restore departmental government, and subject himself to no further restraint than the letter of the constitution imposed. Burke denounced the step in the most philosophical of his political treatises,\* as a move in the direction of despotism. There is no doubt that Burke was right. As George III. succeeded his will became paramount in every branch of the administration ; and the House of Commons lost its control over the Executive. We have seen with what result. Those who recommend or object to departmental government on the ground of its democratic tendencies, might just as reasonably discuss the merits of laudanum as an antidote to somnolency, or commend us to a few bottles of sulphurised champagne as a corrective of nervous irritation.

The question as to the expediency of party might be quietly settled by the plea of its absolute necessity. As long as the human mind remains what it is, no body of men can remain long united upon every matter of detail, though these arise out of principles which they have unanimously accepted. Parties never raged so furiously in France as when the entire country united in giving its sanction to a republican form of government. The excesses of the *Gironde* and *Montagne* show how widely men may differ upon the application of a policy which has commanded their undivided assent. The theologians of an infallible church are divided in matters of dogma into Gallicans and Ultramontanes ; while in morals they manage to make war upon each other under the names of Rigourists and Laxists. There is not a convent in Italy, or a village corporation in Spain, or a parish vestry in England, no matter how strong the ties which bind the brotherhood together, in which party feeling does not array the members into hostile camps, and frequently lead them to try their strength against each other. What else is the civil history of states but that of the wars of the different classes and interests into which they have been divided ? Indeed it would seem in the political world as in the natural, that great institutions are preserved in healthy action by a balance of contending principles, and that the moment the equipoise is destroyed by the languor

\* *Thoughts on the present Discontents.*

of either or both of the conflicting elements, at that moment decay sets in. The strife may change its form, but it seldom ceases. When statesmen are not divided by great principles they generally separate into cliques. In the middle of the last century, when no divergent line of opinion was perceptible, there arose the Wentworths, the Gowers, the Bedfords, the Pittites, and the personal friends of the sovereign, all obstinate to the last degree in keeping up a sharp fire against each other; just as in the middle of the present century, when a similar absence of principle is manifest,—there are the Peelites, the Peace party, the adherents of Lord John Russell, and the followers of the late premier, all frowning upon each other, and resolved to maintain their senatorial isolation. The amalgamation of faction leads to party organization, and the extinction of party terminates in the origin of faction. The love of strife appears so indigenous in the case as to throw an air of speciousness around Hobbes's theory that a state of warfare was the original condition of man. Instead, however, of demanding an impossible state of things, and attempting to make the world over again of chrysolite, we are inclined to take the laws of nature as we find them; and since we cannot do without party in one shape or other, to endeavour to impart to its action a healthy form, and to eliminate its unsound combinations.

This sort of connexion, however, in its natural state, is not a necessary evil to be tolerated, but an essential good to be strengthened and extended. Men soon come to regard those with feelings of confidence whom they find constantly combining with them to give effect to any particular line of policy. Mutual reliance in turn begets amity. The purity and generous sentiments of private relationship become associated with public duties. They invest the performance of official acts with the same disregard of personal interest as is evinced in trust for our own kindred. Party connexion, instead of being a motive of corruption, in this manner frequently becomes a substitute for it. By constantly referring particular measures to general principles, and uniformly acting with those who give effect to those principles, we become steadily fixed in a definite line of policy by every impulse of the intellect and every sentiment of honour.

If we estimate the value of political party from the fact that it gives expression to the two principles in society whose conflict is the essential law of progress, that it prevents either from being carried to excess, and that it enables a nation to render one or the other paramount in its councils, according as its needs require their interposition, the advantages of this sort of combination will expand into colossal magnitude. In every community

there is the party who wish to enjoy and the party who wish to possess; the advocates of stability and the advocates of movement; in one word, aristocracy and democracy. During the hundred days, Napoleon observed within the hearing of Sismohdi, that 'government might be compared to sailing. It is necessary 'to have two elements before your ship can sail. You must 'likewise have two elements before you can direct the vessel of 'the State, in order to use the one as a stay against the other. 'You can never direct a balloon, because floating as it does in a 'single element you have no *point d'appui* to withstand the storms 'which agitate that element.' In the same manner, if there are not two elements in the State, there can be no means of resistance against the excesses of the prevailing principle. By the too rank development of that single principle the country would always be violently hurried away in one direction, without the possibility of safe pilotage. The existence of an opposite element enables us to keep the paramount principle within the bounds of moderation. We can work one against the other, and steer the vessel of the State in a secure course by means of their conflicting powers.

The value of political principles are not like the terms of an exact science, fixed and invariable. Their worth is relative, and must be estimated by a very shifting standard—that of the circumstances of the epoch. Change of circumstances operates upon the embodiment of particular measures much in the same way as a variation of climate operates upon particular medicines. What may act as a restorative in one case, may prove equally destructive in another. The Catholic Relief Bill was a very prudent measure in 1829; had the same measure been carried at any period anterior to 1800, there is little doubt it would have led to the dismemberment of the empire. The Reform Bill was a very wise measure in 1832: had such a measure been successful in 1732, when the country was saturated with Jacobitism, it would have led to the subversion of the constitution. Now one of the greatest advantages of party consists in having always a staff of statesmen ready to carry out those principles in office whose embodiment is required by the circumstances of the epoch. Even the measures they propose are secured from error by the searching criticism of the party whom they have displaced. Many oversights become corrected. What is redundant is lopped off: what is deficient is supplied. The efforts of the governing party to support the national interest are redoubled by the consciousness that a body of men exist who are ready and able to take their places, as soon as they show themselves unworthy of the important trust committed to their keeping. By means of such an opposition

the sovereign and the people possess an alternative in the choice of their ministers, and exercise that efficient control over the conduct of the Executive on which the good of the State so essentially depends. If Parliament outvote an incompetent ministry, and yet in the absence of party organization the majority cannot furnish a set of men sufficiently united to take upon themselves the direction of public affairs, that ministry must still blunder on in its disastrous course. In that case the country would have no escape from an incapable oligarchy unless by improvising a revolution.

Though these advantages doubtless render party combinations essential to the sound working of parliamentary government, we must not expect to find them adequately realized in history. The lust of power which has generally characterized statesmen, even to their own undoing; the necessity we have been under at the most critical juncture of our parliamentary annals of maintaining liberty by corruption; the lax state of social morality which disfigures the greater portion of the period over which these annals extend, have each contributed to introduce a loose habit of political coquetry among party leaders, and to make them regard great principles as a means of attaining power, rather than to seek power as a means of enforcing great principles. The sudden jerks which our history has taken, first in the accession of a Dutchman; then in the recurrence to a Stuart sovereign; then in the reign of two German princes; then in the rule of a native sovereign again, have served to throw parties into situations embarrassing to their political creeds, and to render their proceedings as inconsistent as the old Swiss battalions, who frequently found themselves plundering and protecting the same castles during one campaign. The Whigs who are supposed to be identified with freedom, defended liberty in the reign of William and the two first Georges by measures which would have disgraced the statute-book of Nero or Diocletian; and the Tories who are believed to be the praetorian guards of the crown, then assailed their opponents with arguments and measures which in our day could only find acceptance in a conclave of Chartist. In a few brief years these parties reversed their tactics, though no other change had taken place than the inversion of the position in which they stood to the crown. It may be said of the Whigs that they generally abandon in power the measures they have advocated in opposition; and of the Tories, that the measures they oppose out of office are the first to receive their sanction in power. The disposition of statesmen to break up into cliques is quite as proverbial as their chequered inconsistency.

Hence an elaborate defence of political party, and its actual realization in Westminster, cannot differ less than the most highly wrought ideal sketch of human felicity and the wretched specimens of suburban misery to be found at Fulham or in Spitalfields. When we read Burke's splendid treatise, and then survey the petty cliques and inconsistent factions he endeavoured to defend, it is like passing from the state of society in Petticoat-lane, or in Change-alley, to the Republic of Plato or the Utopia of More.

It is difficult to select any abiding principle to which either party has been faithful in its gyrations, and which, like the touch of Ithuriel's spear, shall make each fling aside their assumed disguise, and start up in their natural proportions. The two great principles which are supposed at the present day to form the field of contention between the two camps, are Religious Toleration and Reform. But it would not be difficult to show that with regard to the first tenet the Whigs have less to say for themselves than the Tories; and with respect to the last, that both parties have been found as frequently in favour of the movement as against it. The Whigs placed shackles on the Roman Catholics: the Tories removed those shackles. The Tories passed the various Relief Bills, and, with the exception of the last, of their own voluntary accord: they founded, extended, and endowed Maynooth. Lord North's Government passed that measure of concession to the Roman Catholic body which caused the Gordon Riots. The same Government carried the repeal of the Test Acts through the Commons, and would, had their ability been commensurate with their wish, have pushed it through the Lords. Walpole, at least during ten years of his administration, had the power to carry the repeal of the same Acts: but the Dissenters could never get him to support the measure, or to make it even an open question in his cabinet. The repeal of Bolingbroke's disgraceful Schism Bill was only carried in a Whig House of Commons by a majority of one, and even then experienced the opposition of this great Whig leader, though he had denounced the enactment when first introduced as worthy only of the policy of a Domitian. The Whig Saville, under North's administration, endeavoured to pass the same prohibitive clauses against the Roman Catholics which Bolingbroke enacted against the Dissenters. He was defeated by a Tory minister. If the Whigs subsequently found the obstinate prejudices of George III., with respect to their new dogma of Roman Catholic toleration, the great obstacle to their return to power, they had to thank the political teaching of their ancestors for the impediment. The king had drunk in his dislike against the Catholic section from the lips of his mother



and her royal father-in-law, who had imbibed it from the Walpoles and the Pelhams. The Whigs had conjured a spirit which they then found themselves too weak to lay.

The question of Parliamentary Reform, which has served in our day to excite the warmest animosity between the two great parties in the State, hardly three-quarters of a century ago furnished any ground of dissension between them. When the younger Pitt introduced his Reform Bill, in 1771, he experienced the opposition of Rockingham's administration flanked by a strong detachment of Tories under Lord North. Even Burke on this occasion allowed himself to be seduced into opposition to a course which his unsuborned intellect would have led him to adopt, by the dazzling attractions of the great Whig family to which he had sworn allegiance. Though the large manufacturing towns had not arisen, and those gross inequalities in the representation did not exist which roused the national ire some quarter of a century ago, still the measure of Pitt was a large instalment of justice in the popular interest, and could not be rejected without strong inconsistency by those who styled themselves the friends of the people. In the first half of the seventeenth century the conduct of the Whigs with regard to this question was still more in violation with their modern professions. They packed the House of Commons with placemen. They bought up boroughs as freely as if constituencies were as legitimate an article for sale as provisions. They raised the franchise. On these points they encountered the virulent animosity of the Tories, who appeared as ardent for Reform as the most advanced supporters of the Attwood Club. Lord Macanlay says the change in the illiberal tendencies of his own school was induced by the contact of its leaders with the tolerant spirit of philosophy. He would lead us to suppose that, after a deep study of the doctrines of Locke and Sidney, and after poring over the pages of the French Encyclopedists, they had risen disgusted with their own notions and resolved to become the apostles of a purer creed. But the fact is, the only philosophy at all in the matter was that ordinary philosophy which adversity commonly teaches. A king ascended the throne who determined to enforce his views independent of the control of the great Whig houses, and those views embraced, not only their own illiberal tenets, but others peculiar to himself. The Tories flew to his aid. The Whigs, after some years' lease of the opposition benches, relapsed the language of Pym and Shaftesbury, and gallantly led their ranks against the policy of the court. The two factions had changed sides, and found themselves in possession of each other's watchwords and weapons. It was St. George and St.

Denis. It now became St. Denis and St. George; with the same sort of concern for their respective principles as the heroes of Cressy and Agincourt had for the divinities they invoked.

If we would trace the lineage of the present generation of Whigs through the framers of the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement down to the Roundheads, and the lineage of the present race of Tories through the last administration of Queen Anne down to Laud and the persecutors of the Star Chamber, the identity will refer to specific descriptions of men and not to similarity of measures. The Whigs of the two first Georges, though sprung from the loins of the Whigs of the Revolution, had little in common with their policy except hostility to the Stuart dynasty. The Tories of Queen Anne and those of the succeeding reign were identically the same persons: yet to get at their respective political creeds we must pass from the opinions of Mr. Bright to those of Mr. Henley. What race of politicians could be more opposite to each other than the courtly Whigs who simpered in the *salons* of George II., and who in the next reign taxed America and joined in the persecution of Wilkes; and those rude gentlemen who exchanged blows with the followers of Rupert on the fields of Marston Moor, or their more polished descendants who turned James out of Whitehall and served William's dinner with the baked meats which had furnished his rival's table? If we want a parallel, we must contrast the Tories who endeavoured to exalt Charles's prerogative above the High Court of Parliament, with their descendants who denounced the Hanoverian kings as the invaders of the constitution. From 1714 to 1754 the Whigs were the party of stability and the Tories of progress. From 1792 to 1855 the Whigs were the party of progress and the Tories of stability. The country has not always enjoyed even the poor advantage of a choice between the contending principles. From the opening of the first Pitt administration to the American War, they acted in conjunction, and, if they have not acted in conjunction during the last ten years, we should like to see the political theorist who could drive the smallest wedge of constitutional difference between them.

Nothing is more apt to generate delusive ideas respecting the contentions of these great parties than to suppose them, like the deities of Osman and Allah, inseparably connected with conflicting principles which constantly impel them into opposite courses of action. Yet no error perhaps is more frequently committed by political writers. The only history we possess of English party is that by Mr. Wingrove Cooke. This gentleman at the outset of his treatise informs his readers he is a Whig; and then

proceeds in the most deliberate fashion to set down every administration as Tory which has been prolific of disaster. The contest in his pages is nothing else than the contest of the good and evil principle of the Manichæans. The writer of the tract, *On the Nature and Prospects of Political Party*, though evidently labouring under a contrary bias, has diligently copied these errors. Thus we have Grenville's government set down as Tory, because, we suspect, it passed the Stamp Act; and Grafton set down in the same category because he persecuted Wilkes. Yet we know that Grafton headed the Rump administration of Chatham, and that the two Grenvilles used to read the king lectures every morning on the necessity of keeping his private friends in order, and restraining them from compromising the acts of his ministers. In the same manner we have Shelburne's administration described as a coalition, though its tendencies, along with those of its leader, were undoubtedly Whig. The error in question is not confined to compilers of parliamentary registers or anonymous pamphleteers, but attaches to leaders of party. The Whig Coryphaeus of our day\* has told us that the two great English parties are separated by conflicting principles and utterly irreconcilable differences: and his lordship doubtless afforded us the best practical illustration of his doctrine when he took his seat as Home Secretary in the Earl of Aberdeen's administration.

During the early years of George III.'s reign, whence the modern school of parties took their origin, and when our political clubs first arose, there were undoubtedly some high notions about the personal influence of kingship, which, combined with devoted attachment to the church, conspired to generate real political differences between the two adverse sections of politicians. Those who ranged themselves on the side of prerogative naturally received the title of those who, prior to the Revolution, advocated the doctrine of the divine and indefeasible rights of kings. But differences with regard to the prerogative have become so narrowed by constitutional practice, that none now can be said to exist; and when any arise out of the casual occurrences of the epoch, the two sections of politicians determine them, not with reference to their traditional policy, but as they bear upon their own immediate interest. Even Lord John Russell, who adduced the question of prerogative as constituting the impassable chasm between the principles of the two parties, gave us a further exemplification of his consistency by defending the claims of Victoria to retain her household, in defiance of the minister

\* Lord John Russell, *On the British Constitution*. Chapter on 'Parties.'

whom she summoned to her councils; although there cannot be a doubt that such an unconstitutional stretch of the prerogative had never been experienced since George III. kept Pitt at the head of the Treasury notwithstanding the repeated and overwhelming defeats of the House of Commons. The Regency Bill afforded another instance how little speculative professions can be depended upon in the political world when they clash with party interests. The Whigs, simply because the last George had become a member of Brookes's, and drank with Sheridan, in full cups, Confusion to the Carlton, could not carry his prerogative too high; and they needed all the vigilance of their opponents to restrain them from conferring on his Royal Highness powers almost commensurate with those of an Asiatic vizier or a Russian despot. The Tory doctrine of prerogative is now as virtually abandoned as that of divine and imprescriptible right. As an emblem of party, it now only exists in the toast of Church and King at foxhunters' dinners, or where the mitre is quartered with the crown on old ale-house signs, or where the crown and the Bible forms a flaunting device on the top of some old country newspaper. In these quarters, of course, the shadows of former things often linger long after the substance of them has disappeared beneath the shifting tide of events which are ever changing and frequently inverting the relation of men to political institutions. What minister could, in our days, maintain with Pitt, that the House of Commons had no negative on the king's appointment of ministers, and that the exercise of independent sovereign authority was essential to the equipoise of the three powers in the constitution (Speech, Feb. 20, 1781). The assumption would invalidate the legislation of this country for more than a century, and impeach the House of Commons of usurping powers belonging to the crown. But the fact is, Pitt took his stand on a theory of the constitution which grew into use during the reign of the Stuarts. That theory, we are afraid, the Revolution sadly damaged. The Whig tenet of ministerial responsibility for every act of the crown,—a tenet now endorsed by their opponents, though first used to bring the foremost of their ancestors to the block,—has damaged that theory still more. A race of foreign sovereigns, and the accession of two Sybarite kings, has almost of necessity led to the encroachment of the minister, and made the minister the mere creature of the House of Commons. The practice of the constitution has thus come to be on every point at variance with the theory. As the increase of the powers of the crown at the present day would augment the personal influence of the minister, and not of the sovereign, the relation of parties to that increase is placed on the same footing. As a

ground of difference between the two factions, the king has vanished, but the church remains.

It appears to be the prevailing sentiment that each party has discharged its mission, that both have exhausted their principles of dissension and stand with the weapons of party warfare broken at their feet. The author of the tract on *Political Party* seems particularly anxious to find them something new, which they can disagree about. Mr. Lendrick, who has the same Conservative bias as 'the Commoner,' coolly insinuates that the contest has dwindled down to a pedestrian match; or in other words, that both parties are to be henceforth regarded as the advocates of liberal measures, and that they most deserve the confidence of the country who evince the greatest alacrity in passing them;—a pretty safe test for the Conservatives, so long as they pander to the radical tendencies of the Commons, and their leader holds his majority in the Lords. A cotemporary reviewer comes to the rescue, and suggests a plan which the present administration would, we fancy, be only too happy to adopt. As parties are no longer separated by conflicting political teaching, the House of Commons is invited to proceed with the prospective Reform Bill by resolutions, with a view to detach the parties of progress from those of stability, and thus to reorganize them anew. But surely all these suggestions spring from a false view of the case. If there is at present an absence of any strong line of demarcation between parties, this arises not from the want of any divergent principles, but rather from the fact of the two sections having abandoned their former exclusiveness and set out to meet each other half way. The Whig party have only to retrace their steps to the position which they took up at the passing of the Reform Bill to erect a wall of brass between them and their opponents. The aristocratic fastidiousness of Woburn and Cambridge House need not be offended with the espousal of any new democratic principles to prevent the Conservatives from poaching on their grounds. They have only to enforce the reforms which they declared were their object in passing the great measure of 1832, and a chasm will spring up over which the Tories cannot pass without the utter annihilation of their political existence. Where is the Appropriation Clause, which did such effective service in driving out the late Sir Robert Peel in 1835? Where is the Irish Deaneries Abolition Bill? Are the Whig aspirations upon church reform to end in a Conservative commission? Where are the Lyncrgean schemes of that little band of patriots who determined in an Edinburgh attic, while living upon black broth and oaten meal, to wage relentless war against fat sinecurists and plethoric corporations?

Alas! sleeping with the remains of Horner in the cold shade of Westminster Abbey. Sydney Smith and Jeffrey lived to see the usual effects of power upon the men whom they lauded as the approaching regenerators of the country. They even became themselves sharers in the degeneracy. They lived to see the great reform measure which was to have been the starting-point of progress, announced as the goal. They lived to see the appropriation-principle openly and shamefully abandoned. They lived to see Brougham imitate the shifting politics of a Wedderburn; and the highest destinies of their party entrusted to an epicure, the aim of whose government appears to have been to discover the minimum of personal activity that can be combined with the maximum of political power. Even Jeffrey was brought so far as to defend the extension of something like State episcopacy in Scotland; and Sydney Smith expressed his surprise to find himself defending against the Archbishop of Canterbury the most monstrous abuses of the Church of England.

The country, however, may fairly ask, before proceeding to a new Reform Bill, what has come out of the last? We have fallen of late too much into the habit of regarding Reform Bills as something of good in themselves, and not simply as a means to an end. We opine if the country was divided into electoral districts to-morrow, and every sane man in possession of a vote, yet if no beneficial legislative changes were to follow such a measure, the people would do well to delegate to the upper classes the idle privilege of the franchise. Reforms in the representation are not to be estimated so much by the speculative rights they embody, as by the practical advantages to which they tend in the improved legislation of the country. Tried by this test, what have the Reform Bills of 1832 produced? Is it the abortive attempt to rid Ireland of too much church, by diminishing the number of officials in one quarter in order to increase them in another: or by pulling down a few episcopal palaces with a view to multiply glebes, and increase the number of temples? Is it the reduction of ten Irish bishoprics, with the singular anomaly of leaving the satellites attached to those bishoprics—the staff of deans and canons, who derive the breath of their official existence from the constitution of those bishoprics—perfectly untouched? Is it the abolition of tithes, by commuting them into a rent-charge? Is it the settlement of church-rates, by allowing their extinction to remain an open question? On all these points the country was promised the most wide and sweeping reforms; yet what have we gained?—a mere feat of legerdemain. The cards have been shuffled, and redistributed, but the issues of the game are the same as before. There was not one of the Whig

ecclesiastical reforms which was not supported by a large section of the old Tory school. Certainly there was not one which the entire party of modern Conservatives would have refused under the least pressure to inaugurate. The late Sir Robert Peel supported the Tithe Commutation Act. The old Duke supported the Irish Church Temporalities Bill. And the present Tory premier, under Whig colours, proposed the first of these measures himself, and would doubtless have proposed any other measure equally alarming, as long as the change simply aimed at the form, and did not, in any way, trench upon the substance of the abuse. The fact is, the Reform Bill was a great triumph, and a great discomfiture. It brought the Whigs back to Downing-street after an eternity of wandering. *Pro tanto*, it was a success. But it proved their utter incapacity to retain what they had fought so hard to secure. In this respect it is one of the greatest defeats in the records of party warfare. The Whigs made no other use of the immense force which an over-sanguine country placed at their disposition than to help their antagonists to shield, under a modification of form, the very abuses which constituted the source of their own weakness and of their enemy's strength. The church has ever been the stronghold of Toryism—the only unvarying badge of its ever-shifting creed. While outside the gates of the Treasury, nothing was heard in the Whig camp but talk about the explosive trains by which the deepest foundations of this fortress were to be undermined, about the scaling-ladders by which its topmost heights were to be stormed. When the captors got in, they made no other use of the spoils which fell into their hands than to strengthen the citadel from which they had experienced the most relentless hostility. Of course, they experienced the fate of all who pursue a temporizing policy—the fate of the Carthaginians at Zama, and the Sannites at Soranum, who were destroyed by the forces which they once too leniently spared. If they are to regain power it must be by reviving the policy which they have abandoned; not, indeed, as a short-sighted provision for the day, but as the vital principle of their political existence. New Reform Bills will not serve the purpose, without boldness of political faith, and abiding constancy in political conviction.

In selecting the Church as battle-ground which would lead to the sound organization of the two parties, we are not desirous of placing the Whigs in an invidious position, or dispatching them upon the pursuit of any Quixotic object. The Appropriation Clause always commanded stout majorities in the House of Commons. Under the annual motion of Sir Henry Ward, those majorities steadily increased. Had not the Melbourne-Russell

Cabinet, to elude the embarrassing position in which this motion yearly placed them, sent off the mover to expend his energies upon the Ionic Greeks, there is little doubt, like every other motion commanding a large increase of the popular sympathies, it would, ere this, have found its way into the Statute Book. The fact is, the Church is no longer the prickly thing to touch she was in the days of Queen Anne. No institution has lost so much ground in the popular favour within the last one hundred and fifty years as the Church of England. It would not be too much to say that the relation in which she stood to the popular sympathy under the rule of the last Stuart queen, has been completely inverted. Then, the attack of the Whigs upon one of the most foolish of her ministers, overturned their administration, and placed their opponents securely in power. In our days, we have seen their opponents driven from the Treasury, and the Whigs quietly borne into their places—not, indeed, by any idle condemnation of the exploded doctrine of divine right, but by an actual attack on the property of the establishment. Even down to the Pelham administration, had any writer ventured to lay a finger of irreverence on a shred of the Church's garment, he would have been summoned to the bar of the House of Commons; his book would have been burnt by the common hangman, and he might thank his destiny if he escaped whipping at a cart's tail, and simply paid the penalty of his indiscretion by half a day's exposure in the pillory to the hooting of an exasperated populace. Now, we conjecture, any member would be allowed to bring in a bill to confiscate three-fourths of the ecclesiastical property in Ireland, and to apply any profits which might accrue from the lay management of the Church estates in England to secular purposes: he might even go into the lobby on the second reading with a considerable following in support of such a measure. While before any fortuitous gathering of people in Kensington Park, or on Wimbledon Common, we doubt not that the proposition to sell off all Church property belonging to the State, and to apply the proceeds to the extinction of the debt, would obtain for the proposer the most deafening exclamations of assent, and the keenest admiration. It is more easy to mark the gradations of the great change from the zenith of popularity to the nadir of decline than to enter into any detailed analysis of the causes of it. First, the film fell off the eyes of the legislature. The Lower House, in 1773, passed the repeal of the Test Acts. In 1772 both Houses, by a large majority, passed those celebrated resolutions in favour of toleration, drawn up by Lord North and Mr. Burke. But the cloud still rested on the masses below. Burke was rudely ejected from the Bristol hustings. North was hissed



whenever he appeared in the streets of London. A mob rose in Smithfield: the gaols were broken open: the magistrates were pelted in the performance of their duty: Lord Camden had his library sacked, and his house burnt over his head: Lord Mansfield was dragged out of his carriage, and his person roughly handled, on his way to the House of Peers. The upper classes now paid the penalty of those angry prejudices which their bigoted ancestors had been too eager to sow. As in the natural world, the waves of popular commotion continued to invade the quiet of the upper atmosphere long after the causes of the commotion which had first issued thence had been folded to rest.

But a change was at hand, also, for the unsophisticated multitude. The pulpit soon ceased to be the only organ by which the thoughts of the educated classes could find their way among the lower. Newspapers sprang up: a Briarean-handed press unmasked its batteries against prejudices on every side: education became extended. The final estrangement of the Jacobites from the Pretender on the accession of George III. no longer furnished Government with a pretext to identify zeal for the Church with the cause of free institutions. In the generation which grew up under these influences, blind ardour soon subsided into complete indifference. In the mean time the political aspects of the Church underwent a change, which turned that indifference into a feeling of direct hostility. The Tories, who, under Anne and the two first Georges, kept the Church fever at its height among the populace, owed a great deal of their success to the alliance of the Church with Radicalism in politics. Everything for which the working man clamoured—annual parliaments, free-trade in corn, abolition of sinecures, and the banishment of placemen from the House of Commons—was bound up with Conservatism and with the integrity of the Church as the palladium of the constitution. But under the two last Georges the current of Toryism set in an opposite direction. The modern representatives of Harley and Bolingbroke, instead of continuing to ally the Church with a Liberal policy, thought it more prudent to associate it with gagging bills and coercion acts; with a course of constitutional restriction which would have denuded the poor man of the privileges of a freeman, and a course of social restriction which would have rendered his living inferior to that of a slave. The effect is, that popular fervour for the Church has long given way to popular antipathy. It is not the least significant sign of the times, as the last census shows, that two-thirds of the nation are already alienated from her teaching. The multitude, ever true to their own interest in domestic politics, have been so long habituated to encountering the Church on the side

of oppression, that they are not even inclined to do her common justice. To think that the Whigs ought to be averted from bringing her temporal relations into something like unison with her spiritual functions by a fear of incurring temporary obloquy is clearly akin to telling a man that to rise with the tide of popular favour is the sure way of becoming a victim to public disgrace.

Never was there an epoch in which it was so necessary for the Liberal party to unite their energies, to concentrate their efforts, and make a move in the right direction. They are opposed by a Government which represents every shade of opinion within the limits of the constitution; whose extreme left, in the persons of Mr. Henley and Lord Chelmsford, leans on the doctrines of Perceval and Eldon, and whose extreme right, in the persons of Mr. Disraeli and Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer, represents the Toryism of Windham and Bolingbroke. Of course the Tory cameleon can be blue or green, as it suits the purposes of the party. It actually at this moment in Ireland is stroking the Catholic with one hand, while solacing the Orangeman with the other. Doubtless Lord Naas and Mr. Newdegate have told their friends in Belfast they have a Government now which will support their interest; while the noble Premier, in accordance with Mr. Disraeli's theory, that 'the Orangeman is the only pure and unadulterated Whig,'\* is offering judicial appointment to editors of ultramontane newspapers, and framing a bill for securing the Maynooth Grant by legal settlement to the Roman Catholic priesthood for ever. The same feat which is performed with religious parties in Ireland is accomplished with political parties in England. Mr. Fendrick assures the Radicals, on the part of the Tories, that the present administration will not only talk about Liberal measures, but pass them; and his language derives some support from the events of the session. In the meantime, if Lord John Manners goes down to Salisbury, or Mr. Henley addresses the rough squires of Oxfordshire, the country is lectured upon the advantage of having a Government which will resist anarchy, and stand by the old constitution of Church and State. It is said that George III.'s idea of a new administration was a change of men without a change of measures. But the present administration seems based upon the principle of giving the country the benefit of a change of measures without putting it to the inconvenience of a change of men. It is the delusion of the kaleidoscope: Though the materials are discordant, yet the Whig, Tory, and Radical measures are to follow each other in such rapid succes-

\* *Vide Coningsby.*

sion, that the whole will assume the appearance of the most perfect symmetry and order. This compact adhesiveness, this solidarity of union, between elements so conflicting, surely affords a lesson by which the Liberal party ought to profit. Their opponents, though separated from each other in their religious and political policy by the whole diameter of thought and feeling, yet manage to meet in harmony at the same council board; to vote in the same lobby, and to carry on by concerted action the government of the country: while the Liberals, undivided by any broad constitutional differences, are split into cliques, and allow frivolous conventional jealousies to act as impassable barriers to united counsels. Doubtless between the two extreme sections of the Liberal party there is much to forget and forgive. The aristocratic portion have been too much in the habit of governing by family connexion; of allowing the rising talent in their own ranks to flicker out in obscure situations, while coroneted feebleness monopolized the great departments of Government, and through its blundering inaptitude brought down disgrace upon the entire body. They have also, when secure in Downing-street, been too much in the habit of abandoning their former professions. These errors they must now assuredly unlearn if they wish again to become the official exponents of the will of the country. We would, however, suggest to the democratic section of this body the expediency of not requiring too much condescension at the hands of their great Whig colleagues as the price of their adhesion. Because the right honourable member for Ashton-under-Lyne when he chooses to head a deputation is not ushered by the under-secretary with obsequious bowings into the chamber of the principal; or because the honourable member for Birmingham is not occasionally fêted at Cambridge House; or because couriers are not continually kept running between his town residence and the Foreign Office with copies of important despatches, we see no reason why the Whigs should be publicly lectured on the want of proper decorum and refined manners. If individual actions are to be too closely scanned, there is an end of political union as well as private friendship. In the former case, still more than in the latter, it is necessary to practise the maxim of the poet if we would keep up anything like permanent association:—

‘*Siehst du, an einem freund sich einen Fehler zeigen,  
So denk an deren zwei, die dir sind selber eigen.*’

For no great cause could be advanced whose defenders allowed its interests to be postponed to the consideration of what was due to their own selfish feelings and vanities. At the shrine of the

great liberal interests of the country we would invite both sections to make a generous sacrifice, the one of its censorious captiousness, and the other of its oligarchic bias, and its political inconstancy. Let them by no means think they will promote the cause of progress by prolonging their own disunion, and giving their opponents an increased tenure of power. Whatever be the character of the measures of the present Government, each successive day of their existence adds to the adherents of Toryism in the church and magistracy, on the judicial and episcopal benches, and delivers some stronghold of the Whigs into their hands. It is foolish to think of strengthening the army by surrendering the camp. The leaders may support liberal measures, but so long as they continue to harass each other's flanks, and refuse to give effect to their principles by the adoption of any concerted line of action, they as virtually abandon the cause as if they went over to the enemy. How long will the country allow its liberal instincts to be neutralized by chronic dissension? How long will country gentlemen register; artisans and mechanics leave their looms and anvils for the polling-booth, and busy townspeople perspire in close committee-rooms, to return a Liberal majority to Parliament, which virtually annihilates itself as soon as it gets into Westminster? If these divisions continue, the country, at the next general election, which cannot be far distant, will not only have to secure a majority of Liberal members, but to take upon itself the functions of those members, in organizing a party, prescribing a policy, and naming a leadership. The public interests suffer when the weak rule by the dissensions of the strong.

# OUR EPILOGUE

## AFFAIRS.

WE are sorry that we cannot congratulate our readers on a purer state of the political atmosphere. Our public men are still exposing constitutional freedom to the taunts of its enemies abroad; and are hoarding up for themselves a vast amount of distrust and discontent at home. Everything is hollow. Conservatism is figuring in a mask. Some of its old foes are becoming expert in that art, and are helping on the game. Toryism is proud, but can stoop to much for the sake of power. Demagogues are vain, and may be oiled to a purpose. How long is this to last?

The rumour now is, that the promised Reform Bill is to be introduced by Lord John Russell. In that case, its failure, it is supposed, will not involve the fate of the ministry. But we shall see.

One effect of the good offices of our Liberals in handing us over to our present masters, may be seen in the greater boldness of the Romanized section among our clergy. What priest ever failed to see the value of the confessional? Grant that, and you have granted all but everything—and are the men who now govern us the men to resist encroachment in that form? Every day is putting the citadel more and more into the hands of the enemy.

Assuredly we have not deserved that our policy should be successful either at home or abroad. Yet have we much in this way for which to be grateful. The Indian Mutiny is quelled. The Empire of China is opened. When has a single year been signalized by greater events in the history of any people?

But even to these events we have to add another, which, in its influence on the future, will probably be still more memorable. The magic of science, which has linked the New World to the Old by a new tie, is a magic from above, not from beneath. It is a light that has come in its season to make two worlds feel how near they are akin.

The note struck at Cherbourg is still reverberating among us, and cannot be hushed. Since the naval application of steam-power, we have almost ceased to be islanders. Unwelcome as the prophecy may be, we venture to predict, that England will become more military than she has been since the days of the Plantagenets, if she is to remain England.

During the last quarter a distinguished French statesman has wished to consult our pages. The copy sent for his perusal has been seized by the officials of the French Government. France has seen better days, and will see them again.

# OUR EPILOGUE

ON

## BOOKS.

---

### LITERATURE.

- (1.) *Notes on the Revolt of the North-West Provinces of India.* By CHARLES RAIKES, Judge of the Sudder Court at Agra. Longmans.
- (2.) *The Crisis in the Punjab, from the 10th of May to the Fall of Delhi.* By FREDERIC COOPER, Esq., C.S., Deputy-Commissioner of Umritsur. Smith, Elder, and Co.
- (3.) *Personal Adventures during the Indian Rebellion in Rohilkund, Futteghur, and Oude.* By WILLIAM EDWARDS, Esq., B.C.S. Smith, Elder, and Co.
- (4.) *An Account of the Mutinies in Oudh, and of the Siege of the Lucknow Residency, with some Observations on the Condition of the Province of Oudh, and on the Causes of the Mutiny of the Bengal Army.* By MARTIN GUBBINS. Bentley.
- (5.) *A Chaplain's Narrative of the Siege of Delhi, from the Outbreak of Meerut to the Capture of Delhi.* By J. E. W. ROTTON, M.A. Smith, Elder, and Co.
- (6.) *Eight Months' Campaign against the Bengal Sepoys during the Mutiny of 1857.* By Colonel GEORGE BOURCHIER. Smith, Elder, and Co.
- (7.) *Service and Adventure with the Khakee Ressalah, or Meerut Volunteer Horse, during the Mutinies of 1857, 1858.* By R. H. W. DUNLOP. Bentley.

THE works with the above titles are the most important of their class that have recently appeared. Taken together, they furnish a large amount of information concerning the origin, progress, and suppression of the most memorable mutiny in history.

Mr. Raikes is a gentleman who has been high in office under the Company for more than a quarter of a century, and his home during all this interval has been in the north-west—the seat of the revolt. Mr. Raikes's account of what took place at Agra during the early stages of the mutiny is deeply interesting. It was well for the multitude of Europeans who were crowded in that place, that the counsels of the mutineers were divided, producing inaction until action was too late. Mr. Raikes describes the causes of the mutiny as being almost entirely military, and states that the ambitious schemes of the sepoys may be traced as far back as the time of our disasters in Cabul. The

honest and industrious classes of the population were generally on the side of the English, and such as looked hopefully to the exemption from taxation which the mutiny promised them, soon began to feel that even taxation may be much less costly than anarchy. The Mohammedans were the most disaffected—so much so that had the people largely sympathized with them he should have felt obliged to ‘despair of governing India for the future.’ Mr. Raikes writes dispassionately, but our sentimentalists will account the policy which he recommends for the pacification of the country nothing less than Draconian. He would inflict capital punishment on whole regiments, if they have been guilty of murdering Europeans, and those who have mutinied or deserted, without being parties to murder, should all be transported. He is a firm believer in the doctrine, that in such circumstances, these Asiatics are only to be governed by terror, and the sign of the strong hand. We should be sorry to think a course so horrible absolutely necessary. It were better not to have India to rule at all, than to have it at such costs. Mr. Raikes’s counsels, in other respects, as to the future composition and distribution of our army, education, and matters of civil administration, seem to be for the most part wise, and the result of thoughtful experience. We should add that Mr. Raikes served for some months as civil agent to Sir Colin Campbell, of whom he is a great admirer.

Mr. Cooper’s *Crisis of the Punjab* is a work of considerable literary ability. It describes the various risings in that province, and the means employed to counteract them. Those means were characterized by wisdom, promptitude, and firmness. Lahore was the centre from which Sir John Lawrence brought his administrative power to bear on the whole of that district. By a skilful disarmament of the disaffected, by a wise discrimination in regard to others, and by a sedulous collection of men and material to meet the exigency, Sir John was, in fact, the man who recovered Delhi, and in so doing may be said to have saved the north-west provinces to British rule. Persons who wish to see how these things were done should read Mr. Cooper’s volume. But Mr. Cooper, in common with Judge Raikes, belongs to the severe class of Indian politicians. As regards the revolted sepoys, judgment without mercy, or something very like it, seems to be his maxim. His account of the wholesale executions, and the Black-hole horrors which overtook the insurgents at Ujnalla, betrays a state of feeling which we are surprised to see surviving as it does to appear in print.

Very different in this respect is the narrative of Mr. Edwards’s *Personal Adventures*. Mr. Edwards was magistrate and collector in the district of Rohilcund, a country which has been in the hands of the mutineers from the time of the outbreak until the march of Sir Colin Campbell upon Bareilly. The collector’s residence was about thirty miles distant from the latter place. In common with the Europeans at Bareilly he had sent his wife and family to Nynee Tal, on learning the course taken by the rebels at Meerut and Delhi. His own escape, described with modest good sense and real Christian feeling is one

of the most remarkable instances of hairbreadth deliverance and intense suffering we have ever read. Had Mr. Edwards been alone, the difficulty of making his way to some place of safety might not have been great, but he would not desert the friends who were naturally looking to him for help, if not for protection. Here is an account of the posture of things when this little band were meditating flight—an account which lays bare one of the sources of popular discontent, so far as Rohilcund was concerned:—

‘I was satisfied that as long as I was alone I could provide for my own safety, having numbers of friends in the district able and anxious to protect and shelter me; but they were unwilling in any way to compromise their own safety by granting an asylum to the others; more especially as some of the party were at feud with the people of the district, in consequence of having purchased estates, sold under harsh circumstances, by decrees of our Civil Courts. To the large number of these sales during the past twelve or fifteen years, and the operation of our revenue system, which has had the result of destroying the gentry of the country and breaking up the village communities, I attribute solely the disorganization of this and the neighbouring districts in these provinces. By fraud or chicanery, a vast number of the estates of families of rank and influence have been alienated, either wholly or in part, and have been purchased by new men—chiefly traders or Government officials—without character or influence over their tenantry. These men, in a vast majority of instances, were also absentees, fearing or disliking to reside on their purchases, where they were looked upon as interlopers and unwelcome intruders. The ancient proprietary of these alienated estates were again living as tenantry on the lands once theirs; by no means reconciled to their change of position, but maintaining their hereditary hold as strong as ever over the sympathies and affections of the agricultural body, who were ready and willing to join their feudal superiors in any attempt to recover their lost position and regain possession of their estates. The ancient landed proprietary body of the Budaon district were thus still in existence, but in the position of tenants, not proprietors. None of the men who had succeeded them as landowners were possessed of sufficient influence or power to give me any aid in maintaining the public tranquillity. On the contrary, the very first people who came in to me, imploring aid, were this new proprietary body, to whom I had a right to look for vigorous and efficient efforts in the maintenance of order. On the other hand, those who really could control the vast masses of the rural population were interested in bringing about a state of disturbance and general anarchy. For more than a year previous to the outbreak I had been publicly representing to superior authority the great abuse of the power of the Civil Courts, and the reckless manner in which they decreed the sale of rights and interests connected with the soil, in satisfaction of petty debts, and the dangerous dislocation of society which was in consequence being produced. I then pointed out that although the old families were being displaced fast, we could not



destroy the memory of the past, or dissolve the ancient connexion between them and their people; and I said distinctly, that in event of any insurrection occurring, we should find this great and influential body, through whom we can alone hope to control and keep under the millions forming the rural classes, ranged against us on the side of the enemy, with their hereditary retainers and followers rallying around them, in spite of our attempts to separate their interests. My warnings were unheeded, and I was treated as an alarmist, who, having hitherto only served in the political department of the State, and being totally inexperienced in revenue matters, could give no sound opinion on the subject.'

But Mr. Edwards's more humane policy had not sufficed to make the sepoy of the district his friends. One of their leaders did his best, by the gravest assurances of friendship, and by solemn protestations and oaths, to draw him into their quarters, for the purpose, as was afterwards ascertained, of adding him to the list of the murdered. Even after he had escaped to some distance, a second attempt was made, with the most consummate artifice, to get him into their hands for that purpose. After passing with much peril through several disturbed villages, the fugitives were checked by a troop of horse evidently bent on their destruction. How it fared with Mr. Edwards and his two companions, Donald and Gibson, at this juncture, is thus described:—

"Mr. Donald, junior, and I were riding in front, accompanied by Multan Khan, and had advanced about two hundred yards from the house, when we observed a body of horsemen drawn up across the road, in a grove immediately in our front, and waiting for us. Multan Khan pulled up his horse, and bade us at once return to the house, as the only chance of saving our lives; for he said that neither himself nor any of his men would advance with us another yard. It was out of the question to attempt to get through this body by our four selves, and so we turned back to the house. I was some way in front, and riding along by the wall of the inclosure in which the house was situated, and not far from the gate, when the mob opened fire upon us, with savage shouts and yells. How I escaped I know not, for the bullets were rapping into the wall all about me; but my horse becoming very restive under the fire, plunged so much that they could neither hit him nor myself. Turning round to see what was going on behind me, I saw Mr. Donald senior, without his hat, trying to get out of the crowd, and a number of men rushing in upon Mr. Gibson and striking at him with swords and sticks. I now noticed Multan Khan and our escort galloping off, leaving us to our fate. My only chance was to attempt to rejoin them; so I called out to Mr. Donald, senior, to follow me, and drawing my revolver, put my horse right at the crowd as hard as I could go. They opened for me right and left, and I passed close to poor Mr. Gibson: I shall never forget his look of agony, as he was ineffectually trying to defend himself from the ruffians who were swarming round him. I could render

him no aid, and was only enabled to save myself through the activity and strength of my horse. Once or twice I was on the point of shooting some of the fellows, but refrained; thinking that threatening them with my pistol was more likely to deter them, as when once a barrel was discharged they might close in upon me, fancying that I could no longer hurt them. I soon got clear of the mob, and joined Multan Khan and the escort, who had by this time halted. Mr. Donald, senior, followed me almost immediately: his horse was severely wounded by a matchlock ball in the near hind leg; but he was himself untouched. His son also rode up soon after; he had escaped unwounded, by riding through the town, and jumping his horse over a ravine where the fellows could not follow him. A man also joined us mounted on my second horse; a difficult animal to manage; he threw his rider almost immediately, then bolted, and was, as I imagined, lost. Multan Khan and the others seemed by no means pleased that we had escaped, and were very threatening in their demeanour. I rode up to the former, and putting my hand on his shoulder, said to him—‘Have you a family and little children?’ He answered by a nod. ‘And are they not dependent on you for their bread?’ He replied ‘Yes.’ ‘Well,’ I said, ‘so have I, and I am confident you are not the man to take my life and destroy their means of support.’ He looked at me for a moment, and then said, ‘I will save your life if I can: follow me.’ He immediately turned and set off at a gallop, and we followed him.

Attempting to make their way to Fattchghur, they come upon two villages, one of which had been set on fire by a body of marauders, who were busy in plundering it. The Europeans were within about a mile of the place when the ‘looting’ gentry became aware of their approach:—

‘They raised a tremendous shout, and commenced rushing to a point where they hoped to be able to cut us off. Then we did ride for our lives; our guide leading us with admirable decision and sagacity. It was a most exciting race for about fifteen minutes. The shouts and yells of these miscreants, and the noise of the flaming villages, excited our horses to such a degree that they needed no urging to do their best. Both mine behaved nobly; Jan Bay carrying his fourteen stone rider as if he was a feather, and my own little Cubulee tearing along and clearing every obstacle as if he enjoyed the fun. The excitement was so great that I quite forgot the danger for the moment; although for some time it was doubtful whether we could clear the mob or not. We just succeeded in doing so, with about two hundred yards to spare; and I shall never forget the yell of rage the fellows raised when they saw they had missed their prey. Happily they had no firearms, and we were therefore quite safe from them after we had once got beyond them. Had Donald been mounted on the miserable pony he purchased instead of my horse, we must all have perished, as he never could have gone the pace, and we of course could not have deserted him; we must all have been cut to pieces. The recovery of my

horse, and his being available for Donald to mount, when I thought him lost for ever, was but one of the many instances of God's merciful interference on our behalf to preserve our lives, which I have thankfully to acknowledge.'

We shall not attempt a description of the sufferings and alarms of Mr. Edwards and his friends in the wretched place of concealment of which they were obliged to avail themselves. Suffice it to say that Mrs. Edwards had relinquished all hope of ever seeing her husband again, and was in widow's attire when the news reached her that he was still living.

The account of the *Mutinies in Oude, and of the Siege of the Lucknow Residency*, by Mr. Gubbins, is the fullest, and, on the whole, the most trustworthy that has yet appeared, especially in relation to the siege. It seems admitted now that it would have been well if Sir Henry Lawrence, in his infirm state of health, had resigned his command to hands less enfeebled than his own. Nothing could be more noble or unselfish than his intentions; but his work was done, and it is to be regretted on every ground that he did not see it. His grand fault, in common with many of the older officials in India, was on the side of trusting the natives, even when facts seemed to demonstrate to others the imprudence—the terrible danger of so doing. 'He listened to the arguments of his friends,' says Mr. Gubbins, 'and was often on the point of issuing orders in accordance with my advice. He could not, however, make up his mind to the measure, and disarmament did not take place. Incessant exertion and anxiety, and the bad news which now daily came in from the out-stations, were at this time making sad inroads upon his health.'

Sir Hugh Wheeler appears to have shared to the full in this credulous feeling with regard to the native troops—and the massacre of Cawnpore was the result. Enough had happened to warrant suspicions of the Nana of Bithoor, and had the suitable precautions been taken his game might have been spoiled. The following is a specimen of the part taken by Mr. Gubbins, though only a civil commissioner, in the military defence of the fortifications, such as they were, at Lucknow:—

'They had discovered our weak side, and crowded in large numbers into the younger Johannes' house and adjacent buildings; and into the Goindah lines. They proceeded to dig a hole in the wall of this latter inclosure, and entered the narrow lane which skirted our compound on that side. A screen of canvas now only separated them from our position, for the inclosing wall was so low that an easy jump would have cleared it. I was on the roof of the out-houses at the south-west angle when Lieutenant Hardinge summoned me to the defence of the lane. I at once comprehended the danger, and hurried to the single loophole by which the lane was commanded. Fortunately the fire from it completely enfiladed the lane, except where two projecting pillars which supported a portico underneath Grant's bas-

tion interrupted its line. No sooner did the enemy see me at this post than some ran back, while a number took shelter behind the portico pillars, from which their muskets protruded. The projecting muzzle of my rifle prevented their leaving their cover, and without doing so they could not reach me, but discharged their muskets at an angle harmlessly. At my right hand was a large loophole which it was necessary to close. A private of the 32nd who joined me, creeping on hands and knees along the roof, brought some boards, with which the opening was quickly barricaded. And only just in time; for the enemy outside fired heavily upon the spot, and more than one bullet fell at our feet hot and flattened from the screen which we had put up. The enemy outside now began to throw over pickaxes and shovels to those beneath the portico, and our position became critical. Had they made a hole into Grant's bastion and poured in through it, our post might have been taken. At this moment I heard the voice of a European behind me, and addressing the party, without turning, begged that the wall in rear of the mutineers might be loopholed, and musketry opened upon them. The person was Major Banks. He approached my post to get a sight of the enemy, and, while looking out incautiously, received a bullet through the temples. I heard the heavy fall, and turned for a second. He was dead; he never moved, and I resumed my guard over the enemy. Long was I kept there, firing on every one who showed himself from two double rifles, which were loaded for me by a faithful chuprassie at my side. After the lapse of two hours assistance came. A mortar was brought down and opened on the enemy. The shells passing close over our heads burst among the crowds below, while we threw ourselves flat along the parapet. The enemy soon fled, those detained beneath the porch springing across the lane with the speed of lamplighters. As they made off, a heavy fire was opened on them from the top of the Brigade Mess. I did not get down from my post till late in the afternoon; and then Major Banks's body was removed. It was buried, as was usual with us, the same night, sewn up in a white sheet. Since the deaths had become numerous, coffins had not been used (we had not indeed the means of making them); but the bodies used to be sewn up in sheets or bedding, and several were committed to the ground in the same grave.

Mr. Gubbins's account of the causes of the revolt is by no means satisfactory. He does not credit the existence of a Mohanmedan conspiracy, a point on which we have ourselves no doubt. He does not suppose that the annexation of Oude had to do with the outbreak; nor does he regard the people as having been in any way parties to it. The native troops, he states, were really offended and alarmed by our interference with their religious prejudices, and that with this aspect of the case the people generally were disposed to sympathize. This was the grievance, and the small number of European troops in the country seemed to say to the malcontents that the remedy was in their own hands. But the passage we have cited from

Mr. Edwards shows that the dishonest encroachments of Europeans on the property of the natives had much to do with disaffection in Rohilcund; and causes of that nature were, we fear, in considerable operation elsewhere. We can readily understand why a commissioner in Oude should not be the man to whom the aggrieved would be likely to express their full sense of wrong.

It has been said that even during the defence of the Residency at Lucknow the caste distinction between the 'covenanted' and the 'uncovenanted,' so haughtily maintained by the civil and military services towards all beneath them, was allowed to manifest itself in ways not to have been expected in circumstances so extraordinary. That Mr. Gubbins was forecasting and kind, and even generous, we do not doubt, but that the distinction between covenanted and uncovenanted was kept up, and in some respects offensively, even during the death-struggle at Lucknow, we can readily believe, from what we know of the spirit of Indian society in this respect. Englishmen at home have no conception of what this thing amounts to. In Indian life generally, its effects are so omnipresent and irritating as to fill the land from end to end with the most bitter heart-burnings. There is no mistake about it—these covenanted people are the Brahmins of the service, and like Brahmins do they acquit themselves towards those who are accounted their inferiors—we say *accounted* their inferiors, because these men themselves are often the most ignorant upstarts in comparison with the men they spurn as below them. We happen to know, for example, that an inferior military officer could dare to horse-whip a servant of the principal of a college out of his house, as a mode of showing contempt for his master! For it must be remembered that the educational service in India, after all the parade that has been made of it, is uncovenanted—that is, the principal of a college is placed on a footing inferior to that of an ensign or a tax-gatherer.

Mr. Rotton's *Narrative of the Siege of Delhi* is such as it became an English clergyman to write. His duty as chaplain to the forces put him in charge of fourteen hospitals. Here is a glance at the infirmaries of the 8th and 10th Regiments:—

'It was melancholy to see nearly every man in either of the three wards languishing from that terrible disease cholera; hardly an inmate was suffering from any other cause. It required strong nerves to withstand the sickening sights of these two infirmaries. The patients constantly retching made the place very offensive. The flies, almost as invulnerable as the sand on the sea-shore, alighted on your face and head, and crawled down your back, through the opening given by the shirt-collar, and occasionally also flew even into your throat, when we were engaged in reading or praying with a dying man,—these and a thousand evils which I cannot mention here, but of which I have a very vivid and unpleasing recollection, severely tested a man's power of endurance. My Bible, sadly marked in consequence of this plague of flies, recalls, every time I open its soiled pages, many an incident which occurred, and many a painful expression of countenance

which I witnessed within these walls with a deep sigh of unfeigned regret.

'So general was the mortal sickness in these hospitals, that at last I could only hope to discharge my duty by taking up a central position, with a chair for a hassock to kneel on in prayer, and making a general supplication for all the patients; while afterwards, with Bible in hand, I read and expounded, extemporaneously, some appropriate passage of Scripture.'

When all preparation had been made for storming the city, and the council of war had settled everything, the chaplain entered a tent where some, who were to take a conspicuous part in that perilous enterprise were assembled. What would be the demeanour, what the words of men at such time?

'Those were questions,' he says, 'concerning which I felt a curiosity and concern as I sat in that tent, more as a hearer than a speaker, and rather as an observer than as one desirous of attracting attention towards myself. These men seemed to realize fully the solemnity of the coming struggle, which might now engage them any hour. Yet were they not disheartened or melancholy, still less were they light and trifling. A lively sense of the country's expectations of them to do their duty, and a determination on their part to do it without favour or partiality to themselves, were the most conspicuous features of the conversation and the company. There was here the absence of all vaunting, and in the place of it was the sobriety of reason, and the inflexibility of Anglo-Saxon purpose and courage. And from what I both saw and heard in that tent, taken in connexion with the conviction which spontaneously sprung up in my own mind, that only the reality of their sentiments had been expressed by the speakers, I went away impressed with an increase of respect for human nature. I saw that with its usual selfishness it could be thoroughly unselfish, and was so on the present occasion.'

With the chaplain's account, the *Eight Months' Campaign*, by Colonel Bouchier, should be read. The clerk's view and the soldier's view of such scenes are alike interesting. One feature in the progress of the siege was significant. No sooner had the Cashmere Gate been thrown open, than multitudes of women and children belonging to the city streamed out, and fled in the direction of the English camp, as if confident of safety there, after all that had been done to European women and children in Delhi. We scarcely need say that their confidence was not ill placed. So great were their numbers that a village was set apart as their asylum.

Mr. Dunlop's *Service and Adventure* is a very spirited performance. The Volunteer Horse, of which he was a member, never amounted to more than fifty. But this small body, it seems, managed to scour the country in all directions, and to make their way to any point, against almost any odds. Mr. Dunlop was shooting in the Himalaya Mountains when news came of the revolt below, and it was then felt to be time to go and shoot elsewhere. The chivalrous tone of the book

seems to justify the belief that the chivalrous things said to have been done were really done.

*Sorrows, Aspirations, and Legends, from India.* By MARY LESLIE. Calcutta. 12mo. Snow, London.—There is genuine feeling and real poetry in this little volume. It consists in part of short pieces on some of the most affecting events connected with the mutiny, and in part of pieces on Indian legends, written before those events had sent their sadness to so many hearts.

*Travels and Discoveries in North and Central Africa.* By HENRY BARTH, Ph.D. D.C.L. Vols. IV., V. Longmans.—The first three volumes of Dr. Barth's travels were reviewed at some length in this Journal (Oct. 1857). We have said nothing in commendation of the former volume that does not apply to the present. The author's narrative does everything but make you see what he saw, and hear what he heard. He conducts you up navigable rivers, shows you the beginnings of villages, the embryo of towns and cities, and reveals to you the eagerness of Negroland to possess the hardware and trinkets of Birmingham, and the gay fabrics of Manchester. He also, as a matter of course, makes you acquainted, as far as possible, with the products of those countries, among which that precious article, cotton, is enumerated. There are new monuments; to interest the historian, new plants and flora to interest the botanist, fossils to excite the wonder of the geologist, and not a little to repay the time bestowed on the work by the naturalist. The people are a mixture of the settled and unsettled, of the abject and the independent; and the face to face condition of Mohammedanism and Paganism is not such as to preclude the hope that much may some day be done there by the new-comer, Christianity. But pleasant as all this is to us, it is seen to be realized at prodigious sacrifice by the traveller. His sufferings from climate and soil, and still more from the prejudice, cunning, treachery, and other vices of the natives, exhibit something of the cost at which this field of knowledge is enlarged. Dr. Barth, however, possesses extraordinary aptness for his vocation. The town of Kanó is twenty degrees inland from Tripoli; and to make thus much of way into Central Africa has been the labour of six years. Kanó numbers 30,000 inhabitants. It is a great place for the production of fabrics from cotton, which are carried as merchandize to Timbúktu and the Atlantic westward, and to Tripoli and the neighbourhood of the Mediterranean northward. Great part of these later volumes is occupied in describing the traveller's visit to Timbúktu. The following extract gives the author's account of the commercial interest of the place:—

‘The difficulties which a place like Timbúktu presents to a free commercial intercourse with Europeans are very great. For while the remarkable situation of the town, at the edge of the desert and on the border of various races, in the present degenerated condition of the native kingdoms, makes a strong government very difficult, nay, almost impossible, its distance from either the west coast or the mouth of the Niger is very considerable. But, on the other hand, the great

importance of its situation at the northern curve or elbow of that majestic river, which, in an immense sweep, encompasses the whole southern half of North Central Africa, including countries densely populated and of the greatest productive capabilities, renders it most desirable to open it to European commerce, while the river itself affords immense facilities for such a purpose. For, although the town is nearer to the French settlements in Algeria on the one side, and those on the Senegal on the other, yet it is separated from the former by a tract of frightful desert, while between it and the Senegal lies an elevated tract of country, nay, along the nearest road, a mountain chain extends of tolerable height. Further, we have here a family which, long before the French commenced their conquest of Algeria, exhibited their friendly feelings toward the English in an unquestionable manner; and at the present moment the most distinguished member of this family is most anxious to open free intercourse with the English. Even in the event of the greatest success of the French policy in Africa, they will never effect the conquest of this region. On the other hand, if a liberal government were secured to Timbuktú, by establishing a ruler independent of the Fúlke of Hamda-Alláhi, who are strongly opposed to all intercourse with Europeans, whether French or English, an immense field might be opened to European commerce, and thus the whole of this part of the world might again be subjected to a wholesome organization.'

Perhaps the error of Dr. Barth's volume lies in a tendency to overrate the commercial advantages of his discoveries; and along with this he certainly has the tendency to dwell with an almost wearisome minuteness on his adventures---this has brought his narrative to five thick octavo volumes; rather too much, we fear, for our busy age to read.

*History of England during the Reign of George III.* Vol. II. By WILLIAM MASSEY, M.P. 8vo.—In a preceding volume Mr. Massey has shown how, in the early part of his reign, George III. succeeded in raising the Tory party into the place of the old 'revolution families.' The party thus brought into ascendancy continued to hold its position until the accession of William IV. Mr. Massey is himself a Whig, and a little more, and of course does not regard with pleasure the circumstances which threw his party into opposition for more than half a century. But Mr. Massey is an intelligent man, looks reflectively on the facts of history, and writes in a tone of commendable moderation. In this volume the great subject is the American war, which brings before us the never-ceasing swell and storm of parties which characterized both England and British America during that struggle. The authorities relating to this period of our history are of vast extent and variety. That Mr. Massey should give proof by citation of his having read them all was hardly to have been expected. But for such a subject he is a great deal too sparing of his vouchers; and his work, we suspect, will suffer from this cause in the estimation of the best judges. But he weaves his material together with much readiness



and skill, and his book is highly pleasant reading. This volume commences with a long chapter on manners, beginning with the Middle Age! We take the following extract from the description of society in England in the early days of George III., both as a sample of the author's style, and on account of the information it conveys:—

‘To Ranelagh, visitors from the country and foreigners always repaired, to see the world of London and English society. Many persons, who did not venture into other public assemblies, found nothing objectionable in the Rotunda at Chelsea. Dignified clergy, statesmen, philosophers, authors, here mingled with fops, fine ladies, country gentlemen, city people, apprentices, kept-mistresses, highwaymen, and thieves. But these assembly-rooms, though open to the public, were, to a certain degree, kept select by the price of admission; and spacious, well-arranged halls, where people could walk about without inconvenience or restraint, meet their friends, and see a variety of manners, while conversation was relieved by brilliant music, must have been far more agreeable than the modern fashion of crowded assemblies at private houses, or formal concerts at which no voices must be heard but those of the paid, or still worse, perhaps of the unprofessional performers. But there were other assemblies a century ago, for which even the dreary dissipation of 1857 is a happy exchange. We have abandoned, I hope for ever, the manifold profligacy of Vauxhall, Cornelys's, and the Pantheon. The gardens on the Surrey side of the river were frequented by persons of fashion up to a recent period; but no person now living has witnessed the debaucheries which were of nightly occurrence at Vauxhall from the time of Queen Anne to an advanced period of the reign of George II'. The boxes were scenes of drunkenness and riot. The dark vistas and secluded alleys were infamous for still more heinous vice and crime. A lady who, by a chance which frequently occurred, lost for a few minutes the protection of her party, was in imminent danger of insult or even outrage. Young women of every condition were, in every place of public resort, unless vigilantly watched, exposed to impertinence from persons who, by social position, were entitled to be called gentlemen. In nine cases out of ten, indeed, such advances would not be met with resentment; and when it happened that a gallant was so unfortunate as to encounter a lady to whom his insolent addresses were unacceptable, it was not without the greatest difficulty that she could escape from her incredulous persecutor. The lessee of Vauxhall made an attempt, in 1764, to retrench the debauchery which made it scandalous, if not unsafe, for any decent woman to enter the gardens. He closed the secluded walks and lit up the recesses; but the young gentlemen of fashion, resenting this invasion of their licence, immediately tore down the barriers, and put out the new lights.

‘But besides these ordinary places of amusement, there were assemblies appropriated to the pleasures of people of quality. Of these the principal were Almack's, Cornelys's and the Coterie. At the first, high play was the principal attraction. Mrs. Cornelys kept a house

in Soho-square of a very exclusive character, but of questionable reputation. Masquerades and operas were the ostensible amusements; assignations were the real business of this establishment. Mrs. Cornelys was prosecuted, in 1771, under the Licensing Act, and she was convicted as a rogue and vagabond for having had an opera performed before people of the first fashion, who paid a guinea each for their tickets. This uncouth interference of the law was highly resented by the patrons of these amusements, and had the effect for a time of rendering her house still more attractive. But the open licence of manners reached, perhaps, its utmost limit at the institution of the Coterie. This was a mixed club of ladies and gentlemen; the ladies balloting for the gentlemen, and the gentlemen balloting for the ladies. It was composed exclusively of people of the highest fashion, and the numbers, therefore, were limited. Such a breach of delicacy and decorum was almost too flagrant for the coarse taste of that day. The Coterie became the subject of satire in every form; and the lampoons, both in prose and verse, to which it gave rise, were of so gross a character, that it is difficult to understand how a woman, who retained any self-respect, could continue, or be suffered by those who had control over her, to continue a member of such an association. This period may, perhaps, with some degree of accuracy, be fixed as that at which the depravity of manners reached the extreme point. For the preceding thirty or forty years the relaxation of moral and religious restraint had been on the increase. Unless we are to discredit the concurrent testimony of the pulpit, the press, the stage, the records of courts of justice, private letters, and tradition, which has hardly ceased to be recent, it is manifest that the depravity of manners in this country, from the accession of the House of Hanover to the end, at least, of the first ten years of George III., was not excelled in the decline of the Roman empire, or in the decay of the old French monarchy. The marriage tie was treated with levity by people of the highest rank and fashion; and many wives, as well as husbands, lived in almost open disregard of their marriage vows. Incontinence was by no means rare among unmarried ladies of good family, and appears not to have materially prejudiced their matrimonial prospects. The facilities afforded by the numerous public places of resort tended mainly to encourage licentious intercourse, and for that reason were denounced by almost every writer and speaker who inveighed against the profligacy of the times. The Bishop of London, in his charge to the clergy in 1750, denounced the places of diversion as mere places of assignation; and in a debate upon a Divorce Bill in the House of Commons, twenty years later, the reformation of manners was pronounced to be hopeless so long as Almack's, Cornelys's, the Coterie, and other places of rendezvous of a similar character were suffered to exist.

Matters are bad enough among us at present, but the nineteenth century has made some advance on the eighteenth.

*Biographical and Critical Essays, Reprinted from Reviews, with*

*Additions and Corrections.* By A. HAYWARD, Esq., Q.C. 2 vols. Longmans.—The author of these volumes is a man of letters without being a bookworm. Mr. Hayward is fond of books, but he is a man of the world, who has seen and heard much that does not come in the way of the rocke. There is no channel through which a person of this cast finds it so convenient to utter his thoughts as the pages of a review. The demand thus made upon him is not too continuous; he can rid himself of his labour before it becomes irksome. Such men cannot be profound; but they do not aim at that, they aim to be clever, and they are so. Mr. Hayward has a fund of anecdote about men in whom society has felt some interest, such as Lord Eldon, Lord Melbourne, and Rogers the poet. Perhaps the paper by which the author is best known is that which seems the most trifling—the ‘Art of Dining.’ But there is an article in this series on ‘Journalism in France,’ written in 1840, which has a large amount of historical significance. Journalism in Paris was then at its zenith; and to the extravagances attendant on its success, France owes much of its present degradation and thralldom. Speaking of that time Mr. Hayward says:—

‘Enter the Chamber of Peers when a new batch are to take their seats, and the odds are that every third man of them is an editor or ex-editor. Attend the Chamber of Deputies on a field day, and the most influential speaker will be a gentleman of the press. Dine at the Rocher de Cancale, and the chief room is engaged by a *Rédacteur en chef*; ask for a stall at the *Théâtre Français*, when Mars or Rachel is to act, and the best are secured for his contributors. That suite of rooms, brilliantly lighted, has been fitted up by the founders of a journal, who give a ball to-night in honour of the undertaking; that Grand Cross of the Legion of Honour, who is just coming out, gaining his decorations by his articles; that splendidly dressed woman who is just going in, is the daughter of a millionaire, who lately bestowed her hand and fortune on a journalist; that gay cabriolet, now dashing through the street, belongs to a theatrical critic who supports himself by levying contributions on the singers and dancers of the opera. *Vogue la galère!* Power, pleasure, places, wealth, ribands, stars, peeresses, truffled turkeys, and champagne, all showered down in endless profusion upon men, many of whom were living *au cinquième*, in want of downright necessities, till the glorious Revolution of July! No wonder that they are intoxicated with their success; that they have grown giddy with their elevation; that like all usurpers, they have forgotten the principles which raised them to the throne, or like other possessors of irresponsible authority, have become capricious, tyrannical, and corrupt.’

Yes—it is thus, in modern society, that democrats prepare the way for despotism. Happily, journalism has not such power among us, but would we were free from mischief and danger in that form. This unlicensed printing is one of the best things in modern civilization, and when abused becomes one of the worst.

*The Oxonian in Thelemarken : or Notes of Travel in South-western Norway in the Summer of 1856, 1857.* By the Rev. F. METCALFE, M.A. 2 vols. Hurst and Blackett.—Mr. Metcalfe, as an M.A. of Oxford, must have left his boyhood some way behind, but his volumes are written quite in summer or Christmas holiday style. Nothing can be more buoyant than the spirit with which he explores shore and creek and mountain glen, and searches after the legends of the hills and valleys from which the great Northmen of our history migrated nearly a thousand years ago. There is nothing profound in what is said by Mr. Metcalfe, but to most English people the book will impart knowledge of a country of which we ought to know more than we do, and the descriptions are sufficiently real and spirited to keep the reader well awake. Here is a picture of a Norwegian church with its congregation all in their best on a Sunday :—

‘As I crossed over,’ he says, ‘from my bed-room next morning to the main building, I found the grass-plot in front of the house thronged by peasants who had come to church, while in the centre of them was the priest in his Lutheran cloak and elaborate frill. The washing and starching of one of these ruffs costs a shilling. The widow of a clergyman in Bergen is a great adept in getting them up, and it is no uncommon thing for them to come to her by steamer from a distance of one hundred and forty English miles. The congregation were in church when I entered with the ladies. We sat all together in a square pew on a level with the chancel dais. This mingling of the sexes, however, was not permitted, of course, among the primitive bonders: the men being on one side of the interior, the women on the other, reminding me of the evening parties in a famous University town. The former wore most of them short seaman’s jackets, though a few old peasants adhered to the antique green coat of singular cut, while their grey locks, which were parted in the centre of the forehead, streamed patriarchally over their shoulders, shading their strongly-marked countenances. The female side was really very picturesque. The head-dress is a white kerchief, elaborately crimped or plaited, but by some ingenious contrivance shaped in front somewhat like the ladies’ small bonnets of the present day, with one corner falling gracefully down behind, like the topping of the Carolina ducks on the water in St. James’s Park. Another part of this complicated piece of linen, which is not plaited, covers the forehead like a frontlet, almost close down to the eyebrows, so that at a distance they looked just like so many nuns. Nevertheless, they were the married women of the audience. The spinsters’ head-dress was more simple. They wore no cap at all. The back hair, which is braided in two bands or tails with an intermixture of red tape, is brought forward on either side of the head and round the temples just on a level with the front hair. For my part, I much admired the clean and classic cut which some of their heads exhibited in consequence. Most of the females wore tight-fitting scarlet bodices edged with green. On either side of their bosom were six silver hooks, to hold a cross chain of the same metal. The

snow-white sleeves of the chemise formed a conspicuous feature in the sparkling parterre. One woman wore a different cap from the rest: its upper part was shaped just like a glory, or nimbus; this is done by inserting within a light piece of wood of that shape. All ornaments, too, were not plain silver, but gilt. She was from Strandebarm, which I passed yesterday on the Fjord, the scene of a celebrated national song—'Bonde i Bryllups Gaarden.' Much psalm-singing prevailed out of Bishop Kingo, of Funen's, psalm-book. The priest then read the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, with the traditional, I suppose, but what sounded to me very frightful, intonation. The sermon was not extempore. . . . Very small and very red babies, not many hours old, I believe—such is the almost superstitious eagerness with which these good folk rush to have that sacred rite administered—were now brought to be christened. No font was visible; there was, however, an angel suspended by a cord from the roof, with deep, flesh-coloured legs and arms, and a gilt robe. In its right hand was a bowl, in its left a book. The glocke, or clerk, a little man in a blue sailor's jacket, here despatched a girl for some water, which was brought, and poured into the bowl, and the ceremony proceeded; which being concluded, the angel was pulled up again midway to the ceiling. The priest then examined some young men and women, who stood on either side of the aisle, he walking up and down in the intervals of the questions. As we left the church a characteristic sight presented itself. . . . Look, some of the church-goers are already in their boats, the red bodices and white sleeves conspicuous from afar, while the dripping oars flash in the sun.'

*Country Life in Piedmont.* By SIGNOR GALLENGA. Chapman and Hall.—This work is carefully arranged, on the plan of imparting real information to the reader on its subject. The work is also amusing as well as instructive—very pleasantly written, evincing a surprising mastery of the English language as coming from a foreigner. It should be added, however, that Signor Gallenga has been long known to authorship in this country as 'L. Mariotti.' We should have been glad to find *Country Life in Piedmont* presenting a more agreeable picture than it does in these pages. The author's long residence in England would seem to have made him very sensible to the need of improvement in many things among his countrymen. Roads, hotels, agriculture, education—all greatly want amending. But in fact, Piedmont is only emerging from a state of things which unfitted her for the possession of a representative government, and has still a great work to do for herself. The marvel is, that she exists as a free state at all, encircled as she is, and even preyed upon from within, by so much that is opposed to all freedom.

*Calendar of State Papers relating to Scotland from the Reign of King Henry VIII. to the Accession of King James I. With a Correspondence relating to Mary Queen of Scots during her detention in England.* Edited by MARKHAM I. THORPE, Esq. 2 vols. Longmans.—This work is the fourth in the series of publications on Eng-

lish history, now making their appearance under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, and it is of more value than the other three. Capgrave's work is of small value; concerning Edward the Confessor there can be little to learn now-a-days; the powerful Franciscan order have not left themselves without an history; and we have seen what Mr. Shirley's volume amounts to—but here we have documents and letters which have never seen the light, never done their proper work in history. Mr. Thorpe has rendered no mean service to the future students of our annals by the care with which he has prepared this large mass of papers for publication. Mr. Froude's state papers are made to tell in favour of Henry VIII. Mr. Thorpe's tend the other way. In these documents Elizabeth rises in our estimation, not so her father. It appears from these papers that when Mary was imprisoned by her subjects in Scotland, Elizabeth stood her friend, and warned the Scots that her hate would fall upon them for all time to come if any harm should happen to their queen whom they were thus treating as their prisoner. Here is a letter from the Earl of Leicester to Sir Nicholas Throgmorton on this point:—

Aug. 6, 1567.

'My other letter was written by her Mai: own comandant; but to be plain with you, as in very deed she is most earnestly affected that way for that Queen, so do I now find most all kind of persons in great dislike with these . . . for this strange manner of proceeding with their natural Sovr, and there is no persuading with the Queen's Mai: to disguise or use policy, for she can not but break out to all men her affections in this matter, and saith most constantly that she will become an utter enemy to that nation, if that Queen perish. And for my part, though I must confess her acts to be loathsome and foul for any prince, yet is the punishment more unnatural, and in my conscience unjustly, and without all . . . authority, done upon her, and surely will never prosper, [I] believe, with the doers. I know not what wresting of Scripture may be used, but these rules we have plain for us in Scripture. In the old law we have the example of David, who w<sup>d</sup> not even touch his anointed sov., when he had him in his will and danger to do what he liked with him. In the new we have plain commandments to obey and love our [sovereigns]; yea, though they be evil, for God sendeth them, not for us [to] punish at our will when they fault, but appointeth them to us, if they [be] evil, to plague us for our faults. The words be plain and the example true; I mean for my part, with God's grace to hope it. I am heartily sorry that those there do no better follow it, for what doth the world say, but subjects, having gotten their prince into their own hands for fear of their own estate, and for ambition to rule, depose their sovereign, and maketh themselves by a colour the head governors. Well, well, though she have been very evil some ways, yet is she overhardly recompensed for so great mercy many ways showed. O my L. of Wyddington! where is his natural bond towards her, that beside with most large and bountiful bounds hath tied him! Let not now private

generosity altogether banish away that due pity that such, even to equals, right for to shew. Hereby, I protest before God, I speak not this to serve my sovereign's turn, but even for conscience' sake, as I am persuaded we ought, for duty's sake, both toward God and men, to do. And as I think that Q. hath justly deserved punishment at God's hand, so hath some ways deserved better consideration at some of her subjects' hands; but fie upon ingratitude! God will now no more suffer that unrevenged than he suffered that Q. by such to be punished. I am sorry I can not speak with him; but I pray you let him know what I w<sup>d</sup> say, and let him remember, and in his conscience, what she hath done and borne with him. Well, Sir Nic<sup>s</sup>, I am glad your doings have been such as Her Mai: greatly likes of; I assure you I never knew her so well accept of you therein. She doth unfignically believe my L. of Murray will do his best for to serve his Sov: I wish he might, so he had both the reforming of her, and government under her. In whose heart, I believe, there is no less pity toward her than both nature and duty doth breed. Good Sir Nic<sup>s</sup> now dispatch your last commission and come away. So fare well; be ye angry most with my L. of Lyddington of all men; remember my letter ye wot of. Yours ever.'

*A Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs, from September 1678 to April 1714.* By NARCISSUS LUTTRELL. 6 vols. Oxford: at the University Press.—Our readers will be aware that a work under the above title holds a conspicuous place as an authority in Lord Macaulay's history. The impression conveyed by his lordship's use of this manuscript is, that it must be as rich in historical material as the diary of Pepys. But it proves to be in reality a dry and dull affair, and those who have edited it, in the true spirit of college idlers, have sent it forth without the least attempt to relieve either its dryness or its dullness. The manuscript has been preserved in the library of All Souls, Oxford, and is given to the public with the most scrupulous fidelity, and without note or comment. Perhaps the learned gentlemen of that establishment have been of opinion that no sort or amount of annotation would possibly save the heavy mass of lumber from sinking into oblivion—and therein they may not be far wrong. But in the hands of Lord Macaulay, raw material is raw material no longer. He does not so much read his authors as translate them, and his translations are all improvements. Luttrell has no power of observation, no eye for the picturesque, but he has a voracious appetite for news, and an unwearied propensity to put all he hears or sees upon paper. In turning over such a mass of rubbish you do, of course, here and there, light upon something worth finding, but it is wandering far for little wool.

*The Age: a Colloquial Satire.* By PHILIP JAMES BAILEY. Chapman and Hall.—Mr. Bailey's *Festus* contains some noble poetry. It was reasonable to expect that a young man, the author of such a work, would both learn and unlearn in the future with equal advantage. But the sequel has not so been. We attempted to read Mr. Bailey's last work—but in vain. The failure in the present instance is more pal-

pable and painful than in the former. It is said of the late Mr. Liston that he always imagined tragedy to be his proper department in the drama; and John Kemble once astonished a dinner-party by declaring that he believed he should have succeeded better as a comic actor than in the walk he had taken. It is under some such illusion, we think, that the author of *Festus* has become the author of *The Age*. The poem consists of a dialogue between a critic, a young author, and a friend, and is meant to be the depository of sharp and wise sayings upon the age—but sad, for the most part, is the doggrel that follows. Some persons may be able to explain this, as for ourselves we can only lament it.

*Franciscan Records.* ('Monumenta Franciscana,' &c.) Edited by G. S. BREWER, M.A. Longmans.—This is another of the series of works now in the course of publication under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. The work consists of three parts. 1. *Thomas of Eccleston, on the Coming of the Minorite Friars into England.* 2. *The Letters of Adam Marsh.* 3. *Register of the Minorite Friars in London.* Eccleston lived under Henry III. Adam Marsh was of the same age, and, in some sense, the founder of the Franciscan school of philosophy in Oxford. The 'Register' of the Minorites is full of notices concerning the principal men and the principal establishments of the order. But the chief value of the publication is as a showing of the nature of that home and city mission work to which the Franciscans of that age were devoted. To them it was left to enter the homes of filth and disease, crime and impiety, which were found then, as they ever have been, in our great cities. Many thanks are due to Mr. Brewer for his patience and perseverance in making such material accessible to the students of our own and of coming time.

*Roman Sepulchral Inscriptions.* By JOHN KENRICK, M.A., F.S.A. London.—A work from the pen of Mr. Kenrick on this subject, however small, is sure to be worth reading. The present publication originated in two papers read before the Yorkshire Philosophical Society. Its aim is to show what may be learnt of Roman thought and feeling from such of these inscriptions as have been preserved. York itself is memorable from the remains of Roman antiquity existing there, the parts of England where stone is plentiful being uniformly the most favourable to such preservations. The work is characterized by the scholarship, and dispassionate good sense, which belongs to everything proceeding from the pen of the author.

*Tudors and Stuarts.* By a DESCENDANT OF THE PLANTAGENETS. 2 vols. Vol. I. Hardwicke.—'My view,' says this descendant of the Plantagenets, 'exhibits Hampden, Sidney, and William Lord Russell 'as three of the most mischievous knaves upon whom party spirit 'ever bestowed a false varnish and brilliancy.' It will be enough for our readers to know that the writer of this volume can rave in this fashion to be assured that the time spent in reading it would be worse than time lost. According to this 'Plantagenet,' English history, as commonly known among us, is all but a lie from beginning to end; and sad is our lot if what is here given us is a sample of the true in



place of the false. In getting rid of the Stuarts, it seems, we expelled a family of injured innocents, and in falling under the tyranny of the Tudors we only met with our desert in forsaking the Plantagenets. We need say no more of the Bedlam themg which is spread through the pages of this volume.

*The Ballads of Scotland.* Edited by WILLIAM EDMONSTONE AYTOUN, D.C.L. 2 vols. Blackwood.—These volumes will help to make the best pieces in Scott's *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border* more accessible both to Scotch and English readers. It is in this field that the genius of old Scotland takes precedence of every other. The existence of such a mass of ballad poetry is evidence, not only of the genius that could produce it, but of the national sympathy that could call it forth, and has preserved it. Not a little of the time which the historian bestows on the makers of laws, might be well extended to the makers of ballads.

*A Month in Yorkshire.* By WALTER WHITE. Chapman and Hall.—Mr. White, who told the world last year what he saw on foot in the Tyrol, and who had told us before of what he saw in a walk from the Strand to the Land's End, here relates his adventures in Yorkshire. The chief value of Mr. White's books is, that they enable the people he visits to see how 'it strikes a stranger,' and that they give what the pedestrian sees and hears in common life—things which people who travel in carriages rarely stop their wheels to inquire about. Our Yorkshire friends may see in Mr. White's book what an intelligent Londoner is likely to think of them and their ways.

*The History of the Origin and Rise of the Republic of Venice.* By WILLIAM CAREW HAZLITT. 2 vols. 8vo. John Russell Smith.—Mr. Hazlitt says he has consulted probably more than three hundred works in the course of his researches with a view to this publication, and that it is compiled 'almost entirely from original materials.' The subject is one of much interest; and one on which a good book has been much wanted; but if Mr. Hazlitt's research has been such as he describes, it is to be regretted that the style in which he has presented its results to us is so ambitious, artificial, and ill-managed. It seems to be an imitation of Gibbon, but it gives us the faults of that writer's manner, with nothing of his real power. It is singularly wanting in simplicity, nature, and clearness, and often becomes an involved mass of high-sounding words and phrases. Take the following sentence as an instance :—

'The late concordat with the Holy See, which gave the patriarch Grado the right of supreme jurisdiction over nineteen episcopal sees in the adjoining provinces, Istria and Dalmatia, was extremely advantageous to the republic, both in a commercial and political respect; impelled by that enterprising spirit, which distinguished them in so marked a degree, the merchants of Venice gradually formed marts and dépôts at Zara, Justinople, and the neighbouring cities; their urbane manners and judicious moderation won in their favour a general feeling of confidence and good will; friendships, intimacies, and matrimonial alliances followed as a natural consequence; and the early

connexion which the Venetians thus established, through a spiritual medium, with the Illyria provinces, may be considered as having in no mean degree prepared the way for the conquest of Dalmatia in 998, by the Doge Pietro Orseoli II.—Vol. i. 95.

Who would engage to travel far through a jungle of this sort? A writer with a natural manner would break down this one sentence into at least half a dozen, and by giving us his thoughts in distinctness and succession, would leave us to receive them easily and naturally. An author is expected to make his thoughts clear for the reader—the reader is not expected to make ‘heim clear for himself. If Mr. Hazlitt would read Gibbon less, and Sidney Smith a great deal more, it would be much to his benefit. Still those who want information as to the ‘origin and rise of Venice,’ such as they will not readily find elsewhere, will do well to read Mr. Hazlitt’s book, bearing with the writer’s manner for the sake of something better.

*The City of the Great King; or, Jerusalem as it is, and as it is to be.* By J. T. BARCLAY, M.D., Missionary to Jerusalem. Trübner. —The tribes still go up to Jerusalem, but they are tribes of Gentiles, not of Israelites—of Christians, not of Jews. Much care has been given of late years to master the topography of this ever memorable city, and it is not a little vexatious to find that the farther the investigation is extended, the more do the points of uncertainty seem to multiply. Germans, English, and Americans have all contributed, not so much to throw a steady light upon the subject, as to give confusion to our ideas respecting it. If Dr. Barclay has not added much to our knowledge, it is due to him to say that it has not been from the want of zeal for his object, nor from any hesitancy as to subjecting himself to a vast amount of physical effort, and even suffering, in the pursuit of it. But his antiquarian zeal, like his religious zeal, is not always ‘according to knowledge.’ He is not skilled in reasoning from the remains of the present to the constructions of the past; and his millenarian theorizing about Jerusalem ‘as it is to be,’ is a sad disfigurement of a book which is little enough attractive in any way.

*History of the Romans Under the Empire.* By the Rev. CHARLES MERIVALE, B.D. Vol. VI.—This volume of a publication which promises to be a standard work in our language, extends the narrative of the author from the reign of Nero to the destruction of Jerusalem. The period embraces the times of Nero, Galba, Otho, Vitellius, and part of the time of Vespasian. The volume commences with a chapter on the Roman conquests in Britain, and sets forth the costs—the heavy costs—which Rome was prepared to incur rather than forego her purpose of ascendancy in this island. Dion, Lucan, and Tacitus, are among the ancient guides mentioned; but Mr. Merivale has been careful to bring the fruits of modern scholarship to his subject, so as to render his work a production proper to the age in which it makes its appearance.

*Northern Travel. Summer and Winter Pictures of Sweden, Lap-*

*land, and Norway.* By BAYARD TAYLOR. Sampson Low, and Co. —Mr. Taylor says that his object in travel is neither scientific, statistical, nor politico-economical; but simply artistic, pictorial—if possible panoramic. The volume answers to this description. It is a book of pictures, and as such is very much the sort of book which a large class of readers will be pleased with. It is so pleasant to get knowledge by merely opening your eyes to receive it. The author's experiences, however, may be of use to those who may wish to travel for something more than amusement.

- *Sporting Scenes among the Kaffirs in South Africa.* By Captain A. W. DRAYTON. 8vo. Routledge.—Captain Drayton is a good-natured gentleman, and his sporting scenes were no doubt such as he describes; but his book is a singularly undigested affair. His transitions from one sort of matter to another are very abrupt, and his style is the most slipshod thing imaginable. But there is an appearance of honesty about what he says, which so far wins your confidence. He does not profess to be learned, or scientific, or a great discoverer, and we will only say he would be very foolish if he did.

*Algiers in 1857.* By the Rev. E. W. L. DAVIES, A.M. Oxon. Longmans.—This volume is intended to describe the accessibility, the climate, and the resources of Algiers, especially for the benefit of such persons as might be disposed to visit it as sufferers from pulmonary sickness. It furnishes information also as to the recreations that are obtainable in the city and its neighbourhood by travellers in general. It is such a book as a thoughtful unambitious English clergyman might be expected to write on such a subject.

*Lettres du Maréchal St. Arnaud, 1832-34.* Paris. 1838.—This is a re-issue with some improvements. But the chief interest of the new edition arises from the life of the Marshal prefixed to the letters by M. Sainte-Beuve. St. Arnaud went to Algeria as lieutenant, and rose in ten years to be a general. His services before that time had laid the foundation of disease, the climate and service of Africa gave it deeper root. St. Arnaud possessed the qualities of the soldier in an eminent degree. He was no statesman—nothing but a soldier. His notion always was, that France had to choose between the anarchy of socialism or the order of despotism. It was the unhappiness of his country to be placed between that alternative. What he did accordingly in connexion with the 2nd of December was done conscientiously. But even St. Arnaud did not suppose that matters in France can end at their present point. 'It is only through a stage of absolute despotism that we can pass to a wise constitutional government,' was his language as far back as 1850. For the present, we suspect, the army of France believes in St. Arnaud's alternative. Such is the manner in which factious and egotistical demagogues play into the hands of despotism.

(*Histoire, &c.*) *History of Marie Antoinette.* By EDMUND and JULES DE GONCOURT.—One more book of pictures and sorrows touching the fate of Marie Antoinette. The chief novelty of this work is, that it contains some letters of the queen, said to be original,

and published for the first time. It is a tale to which there are two sides; MM. Goncourt have given us the favourable side from beginning to end. Marie Antoinette was a queen given by a corrupt court to one still more corrupt, and in whom there was not only much to pity, but much to blame.

*De la Justice dans la Révolution et dans l'Eglise. Nouveaux Principes de Philosophie Pratique adressés à son Eminence Monseigneur Matthieu, Cardinal Archevêque de Besançon.* Par PROUDHON. Paris: Garnier Brothers.—The Cardinal Archbishop Matthieu has been party, it seems, to what M. Proudhon deems a libel on his character, and he has retaliated against the priesthood in which his eminence holds so conspicuous a place. The book has been condemned and seized, but is still widely circulated and read. It presents a vigorous anatomy of French Romanism as the ally of French despotism, and its author evades a heavy fine, and heavy imprisonment, only by keeping clear of the French territory. A church which gags the press, and then uses it to circulate libels in her favour, is a doomed church on the soil of modern France. The day of retribution may tarry, but it will come.

*Histoire de l'Angleterre, &c.* ('The History of England from the Earliest Times.') Par M. BONNEHOSE. Vols. I., II.—A history of England which does not profess to furnish any new material, but which aims to give an intelligent view of the great changes in our history from the earliest times, marking carefully the steps in social progress, and the causes of them. It is written in genial spirit towards our country, and the second volume brings the narrative down to the death of Elizabeth.

*Mémoires de Mademoiselle de Montpensier.* Par S. CHERNEL. Tom. I. Paris: Charpentier.—This work appears in the *Bibliothèque Charpentier*. The works in this series are admirably edited, and the memoirs of Madame Montpensier greatly needed to be taken in hand. The editors of the earlier editions took great liberties with the original narrative. But everything of that nature will be guarded against in the present edition.

*Mémoires du Comte Miot de Melito.* ('Memoirs of Count Miot de Melito.') Three vols. Paris.—These volumes contain an account of French affairs from before the first Revolution to the battle of Waterloo. The Count was a shrewd and pliant gentleman, he served in offices of some importance under the Bourbons, the Republic, and the first Napoleon. He saw much of the chief actors in public affairs through all those changes, and has recorded his impressions concerning them. On the whole, they are an interesting contribution to the works of this class in which French literature is so rich.

*Une Page d'Histoire du Gouvernement Représentatif en Piémont.* Par M. LOUIS CHIALA. Paris.—An intelligent, moderate, and truthful account of the progress of representative government in Piedmont. The service rendered to the cause of Piedmontese freedom by Massimo d'Azeglio and by Count Cavour, is here justly estimated. Nor are their patriotic coadjutors overlooked. Without a strong following

there could be no effective leadership. Offensive, indeed, in the eye of surrounding despots must be the existence of such a state; and the sympathy of England is a feeling on which the Sardinian patriot has a right to calculate. M. Chiala's book is written in French, but with great mastery of the language, and with great ability.

*La Société Française au Dix-septième Siècle.* Par VICTOR COUSIN. Paris: Didier.—This is the title of a work in which M. Cousin is forsaking the philosophy of the present and the future for the society of the past. It is not the change of subject we would wish to see in the declining years of M. Cousin; nor are we sure that his principles as a citizen are quite what they once were. Great men sometimes live too long—long enough to do much towards the undoing of the good they may have done. An aged philosopher should see little to attract him in French society in the seventeenth century.

*Scènes de la vie Russe.* Par M. T. TURGENOFF.—Pictures of Russian life, if real, would be welcome; but these pictures get their colouring from Paris more than from Moscow or St. Petersburg.

*Variétés Littéraires, Morales et Historiques.* Par M. S. DE SACY. — In France, just now, honest journalists have time at their disposal. M. de Sacy, who for thirty years contributed so much to the power of the *Débats*, is here employed in collecting, revising, and republishing such of his articles as may be safely put forth under the present state of things. Many of these papers are on topics of bygone days, and stand quite apart from modern politics, and the learning and skill with which they are treated give us a high conception of the knowledge and talent which have served to make the journalism of France so powerful, whether for good or evil.

*Le Roi Voltaire.* Par ARSENE HOUSSAYE. Paris.—It has pleased M. Houssaye to make a king of Voltaire, and to write a book to show his kingly influence on society. But when the author makes the French Revolution, and the Napoleonism that has followed, to be alike the fruit of his labours, we are obliged to suppose that M. Houssaye is a very poor logician, or that the influence of Voltaire for good is a very doubtful affair. That the kingship of Voltaire may be truly French, his reign is divided into epochs, which are determined by the succession of his different mistresses!

#### A R T.

ALTHOUGH the annual exhibitions have all closed weeks ago, and even the picture-dealers, during this dull interval, have ceased to solicit attention to their undoubted Raphaels which have most unexpectedly been discovered nobody knows where, and *chef-d'œuvres* of Titian most unaccountably hidden for two or three hundred years, it is well to remind our readers that the more important exhibitions of our national

pictures are still open to them; and that, during this dearth of 'something new,' the intelligent lover of art cannot do better than turn to the great masters, and study them carefully and lovingly. It will be a healthful employment—not unlike taking up the works of our great writers after a course of desultory reading—bracing alike to the mind and the taste; and very soon the art-student will find how far more pleasant, as well as improving, it is carefully to study some dozen pictures—it may be but three or four—of the great masters, than to cursorily, and it must be carelessly, glance over some hundreds of second or third-rate merit. Let the reader, by all means, some clear morning—and we have a few even in November—pay a visit to the National Gallery on its reopening, where, besides its well-known stores, the early Florentine pictures, scarcely noticed as yet, save by artists, claim attention alike for their historical associations and for their importance as forming the link between the formal conventionalities of the Byzantine school, and the free grace, and beauty, and spirit, of the earlier Italian painters.

A most valuable acquisition is this collection of Florentine pictures. Here is the very altar-front, painted by Margaritone for the nuns of St. Margaret, at Florence, and which Vasari, three hundred years ago, so carefully described. Ugly enough it certainly is, with its harsh outlined figures in black, red, and white, on a gold ground, putting us greatly in mind of an old japanned screen, but suggesting how great must have been the surprise and delight of all Florence when Cimabue, only a few years after, exhibited paintings so immeasurably superior. And here is a colossal half-length of the Virgin enthroned, attended by angels, by Cimabue himself, solemn, grand, as all Cimabue's figures are; and despite of his well-known defects, defects inseparable from first attempts, exhibiting a noble simplicity. Then the 'Triptych,' by Duccio di Siena, but especially the curious altar-piece by Taddeo Gaddi, the favourite pupil of Giotto, with its attempt at a landscape background, but where the rocks and trees, instead of being thrown out by a blue sky, display themselves against the orthodox burnished gold-ground, prove how long the strife with Byzantine conventionalities lasted. The rich and elaborate altar-piece, although unfortunately divided into parts, must attract the notice of the visitor, but with far greater interest will he contemplate it when he learns that it is the work of the great sculptor and painter, Orcagna, the painter of that solemn pictorial epic, the 'Triumph of Death,' in the Campo Santo, at Pisa. Almost all the early Florentine painters are represented here save Giotto. There is a specimen of Fra Angelico, but a very inferior one, which we must regret, for a 'Holy Family' from his delicate and earnest pencil, would finely contrast with Filippo Lippi's altar-piece, where the Infant Saviour, with coral necklace and bracelets, and the wingless angels at his feet—not harp in hand, but with guitar and violin, well indicate the difference between the monkish artist, whose inspiration was the wine-flask, and whose models, even for the Madonna, were his mistresses, and that pure-minded recluse who never took pencil in hand save with solemn prayer. Ere concluding these slight

notices we must call attention to the exquisite 'Adoration of the Magi,' by Lippi's son, Filippino, the gem of the collection for beauty of design and rich colouring. In addition to these 'art treasures,' we are also promised a fine Ghirlandajo, which will take its place among them upon the reopening of the gallery.

The costly porphyry sarcophagus, hewn and polished at so much expense of time and labour, is now appropriated to its destined purpose, and encloses the remains of 'the hero of a hundred fights,' in the sepulchral crypt at St. Paul's. It is a noble work of art—noble in its grand simplicity—and we could not but regret that it should remain in that dimly-lighted chamber, where we can scarcely discern its beautiful veinings, and where, from the narrow space, no adequate view can be obtained, instead of being placed in some part of the cathedral. What could form a more appropriate centre for the sepulchral chapel than that rich sarcophagus, upon its granite base?

Among our miscellaneous notices, we may here mention that the eighteen bronze statues of the barons who signed Magna Charta have been completed, and, as well as the twelve marble statues of British statesmen, are now placed on their appropriated pedestals, in the palace at Westminster. The Government has, we find, also decided on the purchase of Sir George Hayter's huge picture of 'The First Meeting of the House of Commons after the Passing of the Reform Bill.' As a kind of collective portrait-gallery, this acre of canvas has a certain kind of value; but we think it would be difficult to find any other.

*Memoirs and Letters of the late Thomas Seddon, Artist.* By his BROTHER. Nisbet.—This is a very interesting, though mournful little volume, detailing the aspirations, and endeavours, and struggles, of a gifted young man, who had just surmounted his early difficulties, and had begun to take a prominent place among our rising artists, when he was cut off, after a few days' illness, in his thirty-fifth year. Thomas Seddon, the son and grandson of the cabinet makers whose names are so well known throughout London, evinced, like all children gifted with artist feelings, a love for design from his very infancy, covering the margins of his school books with all manner of drawings, but giving at the same time indications of that love of truth and nature which he afterwards displayed in his eager pursuit of natural history, and his interest in ballad-lore—indeed in all that related to the past. On leaving school, his father determined he should follow his own trade,—hereditary already through three generations of the Seddons. A less congenial trade might have been easily found, for cabinet making is an art manufacture, and although to the aspiring youth sideboards and cheffoniers were mean enough compared with historical pictures, still there was training both for the eye and hand in the cabinet maker's work-shop. But the poor lad yearned for an artist's life, and it was a first step toward this when his father sent him in 1841 to Paris, to study ornamental art. On his return, however, he did not, like too many young students, fling aside all chance of obtaining an honourable livelihood, to devote himself, like poor

Haydon, to 'high art.' He resumed his seat in his father's office, diligently studied the best works on ornamental art, and strove to become foremost in the line to which Providence seemed to have pointed him. In 1818 he gained the silver medal of the Society of Arts, for an ornamental design, and ere long he attained a foremost name as a designer. But all this while, although his days were given to art-manufacture, his nights were devoted to artist's studies, and when in the following year he accompanied some members of the Water Colour Society to Wales, the professional artists found that the graceful designer of chimney-glasses and sideboards could rival them in the beauty of his trees, and surpass them in the delicate finish of his foregrounds. A visit made the following year to Barbisson, in the forest of Fontainebleau, afforded young Seddon opportunities for farther improvement. On his return however, he quietly resumed his profession as a designer, and anxious that others should participate in the benefits of correct training, he established a school for the instruction of workmen in the elements of art, generously devoting a large portion of his already heavily-taxed time to the office of gratuitous teacher. A hundred promising young students availed themselves of this liberal boon; but the generous, self-denied young artist, paid the penalty of his thoughtful kindness in a long and dangerous illness,—rheumatic fever, from which he never wholly recovered. This dangerous illness, however, released him from his former engagements; he now commenced an artist's life, and his first picture, 'Penelope,' proved that he had not mistaken his calling. And now arose strong yearnings to visit the East, to see with his own eyes those scenes which prophets and 'holy men of old' had dwelt among,—scenes dear to him because Bible scenes, that Bible which, since his illness, had become dear to him. Ere long a most favourable opportunity arrived. Holman Hunt was about to travel in the East, so Thomas Seddon set forth to accompany him.

Very pleasant, and remarkably suggestive are the young artist's letters; many passages are indeed word-pictures. There is no vague description, no mere heaping of superlatives together, but clear, vivid drawing and colouring too, for like all the pre-Raphaelites, Seddon had a fine eye for colour, and a keen delight in it. How he remarks again and again upon the exquisite beauty of evening in Egypt, compared with the harsh glare of noontide,—the rosy light 'that bathes the tops, whilst the bases of the buildings and hills are half lost, and melted into the light blue mist;'—the gorgeous sunsets, too, with their floods of crimson fire, just as he has shown us in that admirable picture of his, 'the View of the Pyramids at Sunset.' We have had descriptions enough of the Holy Land, and we have had views enough too, but really how different the descriptions are in these delightful letters, and the views, as painted by the truth-guided pencil of Seddon and Holman Hunt. What a chorus of ridicule burst from all the would-be connoisseurs when that fine picture, 'the Scape-goat,' was exhibited. 'Such a back-ground! where did you ever see a pink and green sky?' Certainly it was not to be seen in England, but with that very



scene before his eyes Seddon writes, 'the Dead Sea seemed motionless, and of a blue so deep that no water I have seen can compare with it. The range of mountains beyond is forty or fifty miles off, and a thin veil of mist seemed to spread between us, and then and the sea, through which they appeared aerial and unreal. When the sun left them, the hazy air above became a singular green colour, and the sky over, rosy red, gradually melting into the blue.' The strange variations not only of light and shadow, but of different coloured lights, too, seem to have made a strong impression on the closely observant painter, and make us still more regret that his early death prevented his giving us those Scripture pictures on which he had for years meditated, and which would have been instinct with the very form and colour, as well as spirit, of the East. With a well-filled portfolio, and several finished pictures,—these were subsequently exhibited, and attracted well-deserved notice,—Thomas Seddon returned home. He married, and at length a prosperous artist life seemed about to open before him, but in the autumn of 1856 he unfortunately determined upon a second visit to the East. He was then far from robust, and the voyage severely tried his already feeble constitution; but he landed at Alexandria full of hopes, and eager to fulfil his great artistic plans. Too soon were these blighted, for after scarcely a week's illness he died on the 23rd of November, 1856, at the Church Mission house, leaving to the artist-world another sad record of a gifted young artist struck down in the midst of his onward career, but to his sorrowing family and friends 'a good hope,' and the soothing memory of his many excellencies. We heartily recommend this little work.

*Recherches sur la Peinture en Email, dans l'Antiquité, et au moyen-âge.* Par JULES LABARTE. 4to. Paris: Didron.—Perhaps, among the many kinds of art-manufacture, that of working in enamel should take the foremost place. Indeed, in its higher forms it becomes art itself; but in its lower forms, it is an art so beautiful, so durable, so capable of being applied to almost every species of ornamentation, that we cannot be surprised to find that, after so many hundred years, enamel should be as highly prized as ever. It is one of the most ancient of arts, for Egypt affords us specimens, and Nineveh and Babylon too. In the ancient world, however, enamelling upon a metallic surface was unknown, and so was the use of *translucent* enamel; and thus in its more beautiful form it was unknown until comparatively recent times. Singularly enough, neither Greece nor Rome appear to have been acquainted with it; and although M. Labarte strives hard to prove that the precious substance termed by the Greeks 'electron' was not amber, as generally supposed, but enamel, we think he fails, inasmuch as he cannot bring forward a single instance of 'electron' being represented as of various colours. Not the least curious fact in the history of enamelling is, however, that while this delicate and elaborate art was scarcely known—even if known at all to Greece and Rome—the Celtic barbarians of the far North-west were largely employing it. M. Labarte refers to this singular fact, but chiefly it would seem to claim for Gaul a pre-eminence in

the art of enamelling, as well as in all other arts; but Mr. Franks, of the British Museum, a writer whose research is far more extensive than M. Labarte's, has proved, in a late most valuable essay, that this claim might be advanced, with far more correctness, in favour of Britain than of Gaul. 'It is not until the third century after Christ,' he says, 'that we obtain any mention of the art of enamelling. Philostratus, a Greek sophist at the court of Julia Domna, wife of Severus, has left a curious work, entitled *Icones*, in which he describes a series of paintings. One of them is a bear hunt; and after mentioning the variegated trappings of the horses, he adds, 'They say that the barbarians, who live in (or by) the ocean, pour these colours on to heated brass, and that they adhere, become as hard as stone, and preserve the designs which are made in them.' The French writers have generally applied this passage to the Gauls, but the term 'by or in the ocean' would refer to the Britons with still greater force. Moreover, the enamelled objects he mentions are bronze horse-trappings, and it is precisely in Britain, and not in Gaul, that such objects are found.' The greater number, too, of enamelled remains, of various kinds, have been found in England; and that beautifully enamelled vase, also—the only one of its kind—which M. Labarte has given an engraving of, was found in Essex.

It seems most likely, therefore, that the art was derived, not from the East, but brought from Britain to Rome, and from thence to Byzantium, and probably about the time when Philostratus wrote, for we must remember that Severus returned direct from Britain to take the imperial crown. At Byzantium, enamelling, from the time of its adoption, was extensively used. M. Labarte thinks that the description of the golden cross erected by Constantine 'after the type he saw in the sky,' and which is described as enriched with 'fair stones and with glass,' refers to enamel. It is, however, far more likely that it refers to the gold mosaics which very soon after were sought for to decorate every church roof; but the gorgeous altar presented by Justinian to Sancta Sophia, and which is described as 'glowing with gold and silver, sapphire and ruby,' was doubtless adorned with transparent enamel. From this time until the close of the twelfth century, the Byzantine enameller supplied brooch, and clasp, and crown, and mitre, to the sovereigns and prelates of Western Europe. Sometimes his art was invoked on a larger scale, for M. Labarte, among his specimens, has given us a most elaborate book-cover composed of enamel and ivory, executed about 1014 for the Emperor Henry II.; but perhaps the most splendid specimen of ancient enamel-work extant is the celebrated 'Pala d'Oro' at St. Mark's, where the ornaments and medallions are of surpassing delicacy. During this time, however, England, although she did not compete with Byzantium, still cultivated the art of enamelling, as well as most delicate goldsmith's work. King Alfred's jewel is well known, and the wife of the Conqueror, in her will, refers to the enamelled cups and covers of the London goldsmith. From about the close of the twelfth century Limoges, however, became the seat of a most celebrated manufactory of enamel; and during

the fourteenth century, mitres, grosiers, and altar-plate—even tombs, *de opere Limovicensi*—form a portion of every inventory of church treasures. We looked over this portion of M. Labarte's work with some interest, hoping to find some curious memorials of art manufacture during the middle ages. In this, however, we were disappointed. Indeed, while the earlier portions of the work seem to have been very carefully written, the latter, relating to the middle ages, are far from being so full, or so interesting, as the subject demands. A work on mediæval enamels alone might be made as entertaining to the general reader as instructive to the art-student.

*A Long Vacation in Continental Picture Galleries.* By the Rev. T. W. JEX BLAKE, M.A. Parker.—The title scarcely explains the object of this little work, for it is a catalogue, with occasional remarks upon the paintings in the chief Continental galleries. The plan, however, is good, and the book will prove, we doubt not, very acceptable to the traveller.

#### S C I E N C E.

*The Human Mind in its relation to the Brain and Nervous System.* By DANIEL NOBLE, M.D. Churchill.—Dr. Noble has spent much time and thought in that border-region where mind and body are supposed to unite, and where the mutual operation must be sought which give us the phenomena with which we are familiar. The qualities of mind necessary for prosecuting inquiries of this nature wisely are not common. Knowledge of the domain of physics and metaphysics—and knowledge so far as physiology and psychology are concerned, which shall be both comprehensive and discriminating, is indispensable. Not less so is soundness of judgment, which will not be seduced into theorizing, which will not accept assertion where there should be proof, and will not attempt proof where it is the province of reason to affirm that proof is not possible. Such fitnesses for his work Dr. Noble possesses in a high degree. He never dogmatizes, he never allows his imagination, or a love of system, to make him insensible to the real language of facts. In the history of science there are syren voices which are ever doing their best to allure the inquirer into hasty generalizations. Dr. Noble has heard their notes before to day, and has come to be about as proof against them as most men. Symmetry and system are very beautiful when we can realise them, but it is the fact of their beauty that disposes men to persuade themselves that they have them when they have not. In the one hundred and fifty pages of which this volume consists, Dr. Noble has given us a large amount of interesting information, and of cautious scientific thought, for which the medical student, and the intelligent reader generally, should be grateful.

*Animal Physiology for Schools.* By JOHN DIONYSIUS LARDNER, D.C.L. — Another of Dr. Lardner's admirable series of scientific manuals for schools. It is illustrated by nearly two hundred engravings.

*The Story of a Boulder; or, Gleanings from the Note-book of a Field Geologist.* By ARCHIBALD GEIKIE. Constable.—This is a pleasantly written book, presenting the results of much geological observation, and well adapted to stimulate those who read it to observation of their own. Every one who has his times for walking in the fields, and every man who can have such times should secure them, may find in this pocket volume a very intelligent and agreeable companion.

*The Taming of Horses*, by J. T. RAREY.—So the secret of Mr. Rarey's system, about which people have been going so wild, is before the world at last. In spite of all the ten-guinea pupils' bonds it has oozed out. It seems that some few years ago, when Mr. Rarey was as yet unknown to fame, he wrote a little book on his art, and now that enterprising Mr. Routledge has got hold of it, and sells it for sixpence; (Tattersall was charging his customers half a guinea for the same thing;) and a very good sixpennyworth it is. But now people cry out as if they had been swindled, and say,—‘There is nothing in it after all; we knew all this before; it is nothing but common sense.’ We say there is everything in the world in it. If the prophet had bid thee do some great thing, oh ingenuous public, wouldest thou not have done it? And now because there is no *hocus* *pocus*, no galvanism, nor magnetism, nor any other *ism*, forsooth you have been greatly deceived. ‘Out upon the false prophet!’

One of Mr. Rarey's pupils, in a letter to the *Times*, certifies that the little book contains more than can be taught in the lesson for which he paid his money; and another writes to contradict him. With the former we must agree, for though the book gives the clue to the system, and a sketch of it, it would be a great satisfaction to a man, before he went into the stable where his own particular Cruiser was loose and rampant, to see how this master of his art managed his approach; how he held the horse with his eye; how cautiously, firmly, and quietly he advanced towards him. Mr. Briggs is before the public as a warning in the pages of *Punch*. Ourselves know two young gentlemen, one laid up with a bad kick in the leg, and another who had his shoulder put out, all owing to this little book. Not one in a hundred of Mr. Rarey's pupils who have paid their ten guineas, and watched Cruiser and him with all their eyes, would prove man enough to undertake the subjugation of a high spirited, vicious horse; much more one who has only studied the system in this condensed and imperfect form.

After all there is nothing but common sense in the book, but then that common sense happens to be no common thing. Patience, gentleness, and firmness are the watchwords which we hope will spread all over the land as the heralds of peace and good will to horses. But the art isn't to be learnt in an hour. A man must serve his appren-

ticeship to it. It requires a rare combination of good qualities to make a perfect horseman. One must have a perfect command of himself to begin with, judgment, presence of mind, courage, and a certain quickness of eye and hand, and rapidity of decision, which can only be acquired by long practice.

There is a flourish of trumpets at the beginning of this otherwise unpretentious little book, about the way in which the Greek and Roman young gentlemen used to ride; but that one can see any day by going to the British Museum where Mr. Finch holds his court, the sculpture court. There you will see those noble youths with their hair nicely cut, sitting on the bare backs of their chargers, and guiding them with their hands; you will observe also that they do not sit badly considering they have not the advantages we possess of pig's skin and stirrups to keep them square and trig. A friend of ours doubts though, if they could go across country with the Blankshire hounds in that trim. Mr. Rarey's three fundamental principles may be all resolved into one; viz., that a horse must *learn* a thing before he can know it. He doesn't know what man wants him to do till he is taught. He does not know his strength till some one pulls him. He doesn't know that a thing will hurt him before it has done so. He is, in fact, a perfect example of Locke's blank sheet of paper—you may write what you like upon him. A pretty scrawl most folks make of it!

What is the first thing a breaker does with a raw colt? He drives and bullies him into a house (dark very likely, and dreadful looking in the eyes of the timid animal), which takes a long time generally,—men shouting, and running, and scaring him with their arms, and the colt bolting and starting this way and that, till at last he bolts into the house to escape the worse dangers outside. Of course sensible men proceed more sensibly. Then you must get a halter that slips; a rope halter that will tumble him if he gives trouble, and when you have got him into this (which I promise you shall by a lesson in patience), you can smack a whip about him two or three times, which will nearly make him fly out of his skin, to punish him for having caused you so much fatigue. He doesn't know what you are whipping him for, but you do, and you are hot and angry, so it's all right. Then drag him out. You must have an army of men now to hang on to the rope, (just to teach him his strength) which must be a pretty tough one, while you with your whip drive the poor frightened brute round and round. When he gets giddy, or tired, or sulky, as he is almost sure to, after you have been at him some time, just rattle a stick in your hat, and that will set him off again at a tangent, very likely pulling your men all down in a heap like a game of French and English. Defend us from such games! Well, so the thing goes on in England every day, sometimes better, and oftentimes worse. What wonder then at the vicious horses, or the accidents they occasion, when this is their entrance into public life.

We do not quite assent to the blank paper theory though. A colt knows a thing or two before you begin with it. That wicked old mare,

with all her knowledge of the world, and ignorance of it, has not had the young one galloping and gallivanting about in the pasture so many months for nothing. Depend upon it she has taught it all her wicked old tricks and fancies, and told it all her old stories of frights and accidents and ill treatment, and we dare say she knows a good many; but it is now for you, O, horse breaker (*horse tamer* is the new and gentler word) 'to teach it a lesson. Mr. Rarey would set *one* man horse taming, not a dozen. The quieter you are with a colt, and the fewer people you have about, and almost the longer time you are about it, the better.' 'Haste makes waste,' Mr. Rarey says. You are not to shout, and drive, and lift your arms, but walk quietly round your herd in the pasture, stopping when they are scared, and then slowly moving on again, walking them gently into the pound. Then you should lead a gentle horse into the stable and 'hitch him' (says this American), again gradually walking the colt in, letting patience have perfect mastery over you. As soon as he is in, remove the quiet horse and shut the door. You should now give him a few ears of corn to put him in good humour, and leave him to take note of his apartment. Now is your time for a little cool reflection, and to look after your tools. Mr. Rarey makes a great point (and he is right) of having a good leather halter instead of a rope one with a slipping noose; and you should have it the right size, neither too tight nor too loose. After about a quarter of an hour you are ready to 'walk into him,' which you must do gently as before. The horse will most likely run from you and turn away his head, when you must walk about slowly and softly so that he can see you whenever he turns his head, which he will do in a short time. The moment he turns towards you hold out your left hand, and stand perfectly still, keeping your eyes on the horse, and watching his motions, if he makes any (we can imagine *Cruikshank's* motions under these circumstances!), then if he do not stir for ten or fifteen minutes (patience guide you, gentle horse tamer! Fifteen minutes holding out your left hand!)—then, we say, if he does not stir for ten or fifteen minutes, advance as slowly and quietly as possible, always holding out your hand. And so on (Oh! how gradually and patiently!) till you get near enough to touch his forehead, then raise 'slowly and by degrees' your hand, and—but it would not profit the general reader to follow this marvel of patience and courage through all his operations,—the system is one throughout. The motto is 'fear, love, and obey.' You must handle your horse a good deal, and talk to him and pat him when he is good, 'for the horse soon learns to read the expression of the face and voice, and will know as well when fear, love, or anger prevails as you do; two of which, *fear* and *anger*, a good horseman 'should never feel.' Whenever you have to correct a horse do it 'with a good deal of vigour, but always without anger. Never go into a pitched battle with your horse, and after the correction caress him a good deal more than you have whipped him—then you will excite the two controlling passions of his nature, love and

'fear, and he will love and fear you, and obey quietly, *as soon as he learns what to do.*' 'One harsh word will so excite a nervous horse as to increase his pulse ten beats in a minute.' These are some of Mr. Rarey's key-notes. There is a good deal of valuable teaching in this little book, if it be only to confirm a good horseman in his previous opinions and ways (he that is British will be British still, in spite of all the teaching), and to teach the credulous world that there is no quackery even in horsemanship, and no royal road to that art. For ourselves, we greatly respect Mr. Rarey for the perfection he has attained in this art, as much as, or rather more than, if he had employed some extraordinary means for effecting his gentle purpose, instead of those which God has given him of superior sagacity, will, and mind. We think the publication of the secret by which Mr. Rarey accomplishes so much (for however people laugh at the system they cannot deny the facts) may prove no mean step to civilization; for surely whatever tends to humanize in any marked degree may be so described. Far from grudging him his ten-guinea pupils, we wish him many of them, both for his sake and their own; and when they drop off we hope he will let in the public; our coachmen and grooms, horse-breakers, omnibus-drivers, draymen, cabmen, and watermen, and for a small sum give them a lesson of gentleness and humanity. We could almost wish that other Mr. Rarey, the married clergyman (of the advertisement), who is so successful with unruly children, would step forth and give lessons at ten guineas, and write little green books that all the world might learn his system too.

#### THEOLOGY.

*On the Authorised Version of the New Testament: in Connexion with some recent proposals for its Revision.* By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, D.D. J. W. Parker and Son.—Not a few will attach much importance to the judgment of Dr. Trench on the question which has led to this publication. In brief, the Dean of Westminster thinks that a revision of our authorised version must come. The demand for it is becoming wider, more general; and the attempts being made, both in this country and America, to meet this demand, show that if the work be not done in the best manner and by the most trustworthy, it will be virtually done by parties who had better not be the parties to do it, and in a manner that will not be so generally satisfactory as it might have been. Dr. Trench dwells with becoming sentiment on the fact, that as the division between Puritans and High Churchmen in the seventeenth century did not prevent their being one in the reception of the authorised version of 1611, so the great subsequent division between Conformists and Nonconformists has left them in

possession, with scarcely an exception, of the common treasure then supplied to them, and that not only England, but her colonies, and America are all wont to read the lessons from the mouth of God in the same English words. The fact that the religious life of so large a portion of the human family has been so long nourished by this influence is a strong reason against attempting anything like a *new* version. On many grounds that should not be contemplated for a moment. The excellences of the existing translation are too many, and its real faults are too few to allow of such a course. But a *revised* translation *must* come, *ought* to come, and the great question is how it may be made to come best. One great preliminary difficulty concerns the Greek text that should be taken as the basis of such proposed revision. This circumstance, and others, seem to say that the time is not yet ripe for actually entering upon such a work. But even when that time comes, Dr. Trench thinks there should not, for a considerable interval, be any interference with the English text. Then, he goes on to say:—

‘Let come together, and if possible not of self-will, but with some authorization, royal or ecclesiastical, or both, such a body of scholars and divines as would deserve and would obtain the confidence of the whole Church. Fortunately, no points at issue among ourselves threaten to come into discussion or debate; so that the unhappy divisions of our time would not have added any additional embarrassment to a matter embarrassed enough already. Nay, of such immense importance would it be to carry with us, in whatever might be done, the whole Christian people of England, that it would be desirable to invite all scholars, all who represented any important portion of the Biblical scholarship of the land, to assist with their suggestions here, even though they might not belong to the Church. Of course they would be asked as scholars, not as Dissenters. But it were a matter so deeply to be regretted, that these should revise, and that we should revise, thus parting company in the one thing which now holds us so strongly together, while it would be so hopeless, indeed so unreasonable, to expect that they should accept our revision, having themselves had no voice in it, that we ought not to stand on any punctilios here, but should be prepared rather to sacrifice everything non-essential for the averting of such a catastrophe.

‘Let then such a body as this, inspiring confidence at once by their piety, their learning, and their prudence, draw out such a list of emendations as were lifted beyond all doubt in the eye of every one whose voice had any right to be heard on the matter; avoiding all luxury of emendation, abstaining from all which was not of primary necessity, from much in which they might have fitly allowed themselves, if they had not been building on foundations already laid, and which could not, without great inconvenience, be disturbed—using the same moderation here which Jerome used in his revision of the Latin. Let them very briefly, but with just as much learned explanation as should be needful, justify these emendations where they were not self-evident. Let them, if this should be their conviction, express their sense of the



desirableness that these should, at some future day, be introduced into the received text, as bringing it into more perfect accord and harmony with the original Scripture. Having done this, let them leave these emendations to ripen in the public mind, gradually to commend themselves to all students of God's holy Word. Supposing the emendations, such as ought to, and would do this, there would probably ere long be a general desire for their admission into the text; and in due time this admission might follow. All abrupt change would thus be avoided—all forcing of alterations on those not prepared to receive them. That which at length came in would excite no surprise, no perplexity, or at least very little, having already, in the minds of many, displaced that of which it now at length took openly the room.'—pp. 137—139.

Dr. Trench supposes that good would come from such a movement, though these emendations should never be transferred to the text; and his own volume may certainly be taken as a fair sample of the valuable criticism which such a project could hardly fail to call forth. Its material is classed as follows:—1. Introductory Remarks. 2. On the English of the Authorized Version. 3. On some Questions of Translation. 4. On some Unnecessary Distinctions Introduced. 5. On some Real Distinctions Effaced. 6. On some Better Renderings Forsaken, or put in the Margin. 7. On some Errors of Greek Grammar in our Version. 8. On some Questionable Renderings of Words. 9. On some Words wholly or partially Mistranslated. 10. On some Charges justly brought against our Version. 11. On the best means of carrying out a Revision.

*Remains of a very ancient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac, hitherto unknown in Europe.* Discovered, edited, and translated by WILLIAM CURETON, D.D., F.R.S., &c. &c. London: John Murray. 1858.—Amongst the treasures of the Nitrian monasteries in Egypt, now safely housed in the British Museum, Dr. Cureton has discovered extensive fragments of a Syriac version of the Gospels, which he believes to be even more ancient than that most venerable of all translations hitherto known, the Peshito, itself made certainly not later than the second century. Indeed, his Syriac Matthew he regards as almost identical with the lost Hebrew (Syro-Chaldaic) original of the Apostles. Into the grounds of this opinion we cannot here enter, but content ourselves with calling attention to his interesting publication, and heartily thanking him for this inestimable boon to Biblical philology. We may probably recur to the subject at greater length on some future occasion. Meanwhile, however, we cannot refrain from expressing our surprise at his having revived Eichhorn's theory of a Protevangelium, which he ought to be aware has been long since utterly exploded.

*The Sinlessness of Jesus.* By Dr. C. ULLMANN. Translated from the German. Clark.—A book full of beautiful and profound thought, such as does not find a place at present, more than partially, in our English theology.

## INDEX.

*Buckle on Civilization.*—Destiny and intellect—leading principles of the work, 4—6 ; effects attributed to climate and cheap food, 7—11 ; effects attributed to the aspects of nature, 13—15 ; necessity and freedom, 16, 17 ; metaphysics *versus* statistics, 18—21 ; relations of intelligence and moral feeling, 23—27 ; religion in its relation to civilization, 28—32 ; relation of literature to civilization, 33, 34 ; relation of government to civilization, 34—36 ; scepticism, its relation to progress, 36—48.

*Political Economy in France.*—Its origin, 45 ; different origin of the English system, 47, 48 ; comparison of the two methods, 49 ; the chief of the modern French school, 50, 51 ; outline of M. Bastiat's method, 52, 53 ; begins in wants, and ends in gratifications, 55 ; exchange of services, 57 ; individuals must help one another, 59 ; doctrines as to capital, 61 ; capital not represented by commodities, 62—64 ; advantages of capital, 65 ; distribution dependent on property, 67 ; the English view, 69 ; present condition of France, 71 ; probability of future revolutions, 72, 73.

*Swainson on the Creeds.*—Progressive theology—how far to be expected, 74—76 ; the true idea of Revelation, 77 ; discovery in theology and science, 78, 79 ; authority of Scripture—what is it ? 80, 81 ; the right of private judgment, 82—86 ; characteristics of modern unbelief, 87, 88.

*Montaigne.*—Literary relations between France and England, 89 ; educational theories of his father, 91 ; his education, 93 ; his idiosyncrasies, 95 ; character of religious wars in France, 97 ; twofold character of English revolutions, 98, 99 ; his conservatism, 100, 101 ; diary of his tour, 102, 103 ; his experience in Rome, 105 ; his vanity, 107 ; character and influence of his *Essays*, 108—110 ; his egotism, 111 ; his adiaphorism, 113 ; his reserve on religion, 114, 115 ; his depreciation of human reason, 117 ; his classical prejudices, 119 ; character and effect of his thinking, 119—121.

*Dr. Samuel Brown and his Theories.*—A modern alchemist, 123 ; obscurities of diction, 125 ; his laboratory, 127 ; affirmations true, negations false, 129 ; the search after the prime element, 131 ; the great mystery, 133 ; numerical relations among equivalents, 135 ; biographical sketches in prose and verse, 137 ; Comte's epochs of science, 139 ; Dr. Brown's lay sermons, 141 ; the books of *Nature* and *Revelation*, 143 ; physical puritanism, 145 ; homœopathy, mesmerism, ghosts 147 ; unity of plan, 148, 149.

*Guizot's History of his own Time.*—Bonaparte I. a warning to his successor, 151; Madame de Staël, Montalembert, Berryer, 153; Abbé Montesquieu, Guizot labours under him, 154, 155; literature, oratory, and science under the Restoration, 156—158; Guizot's first interview with Louis XVIII.; Fouché, Vitrolles, and Wellington, 161; fall of Fouché and Talleyrand, 163; Barbé Marbois—execution of Ney, 165; the doctrinaire party, 167; Baroche Père—Baroche Fils, 169; Decazes, St. Cyr, Clarke, Duke of Feltre, 171; Charles X., Vilelle, 173; Martignac, Guizot's lectures, Aide-toi Society, 175; imperialism, Derby, Disraeli, Malmesbury, 177; the military power as opposed to the civil, 179.

*Five Sermons by Dr. Chenevix Trench.*—Dr. Trench's position as a divine, 183; the Incarnation—the worship of force, 186; Christian worship and man-worship, 187; the Atonement, 189—195; the lights of the world, 197.

*India and the House of Commons.*—Mr. Disraeli at Slough, 201; and on the Conspiracy Bill, 208; French policy of Lord Derby's Government, 205; his Indian legislation, 207; historical relations between Great Britain and Oude, 209; long-threatened annexation of Oude, 211; Lord Canning and Sir James Outram, 213; merits of Lord Canning's proclamation, 215; power and faithlessness of the Talukdars, 217; British and native government of Oude, 219; the peasantry of Oude and the talukdars, 221; Dr. Duff on Indian misgovernment, 223; our Indian legislation, 225.

**AFFAIRS, 227.**

## EPILIQUE.

228—264.

### LITERATURE.

Motley's Rise of the Dutch Republic, 228.  
Madame Pontès on German Poetry, 228.  
Memoirs of Felice Orsini, 229.  
Wright's Fishes and Fishing, 229.  
Shirreff on the Education of Women, 230.  
Wiseman on the Last Four Popes, 230.  
Brimley's Essays, 231.  
Berkeley's Forests of France, 231.  
Mrs. Hornby on Stamboul, 232.  
Louis Blanc's Historical Revelations, 232.  
Macknight's Life of Burke, 232.  
Bell's Wayside Pictures, 233.  
Forster's Essays, 233.  
Kidder and Fletcher on Brazil, 233.  
Dawbarn on Naples and Ferdinand, 233.  
St. John on Popular Education, 234.  
Browne's Lives of Prime Ministers, 234.  
Duthie's Tramp's Wallet, 234.  
Yule's Mission to Ava, 234.  
Fosteriana, 235.  
Mason's English Grammar, 235.  
Mrs. Stone's God's Acre, 235.  
Doran's History of Court Fools, 235.  
Townend's Descendants of the Stuarts, 236.  
The Heiress of Vernon Hall, 236.  
French Literature, 236—239.

### ART.

Water Colour Exhibitions, 239.  
British Gallery, 239—244.  
Birch's Ancient Pottery, 241.  
Gilbert on Art, 245.  
Scott on Architecture, 246.

### SCIENCE.

Transactions of the National Association  
247—250.  
Bailey on Mental Philosophy, 250.  
Ferguson on the Microscope, 251.

### THEOLOGY.

Bengel's Gnomon of the New Testament,  
252.  
Fairbairn's Hermeneutical Manual, 253.  
James's Christian Hope, 253.  
Gardner's Faiths of the World, 253.  
Kalisch's Commentary, 254.  
Walker's God Revealed, 254.  
Smith's History of Joseph, 255.  
Etheridge's Life of Dr. Adam Clarke, 256.  
Christoffel's Life of Zinglius, 256.  
Macdonald on the Creation and Fall, 258.  
Fletcher's Southern Reporter, 258.  
German Publications, 258—264.

*Froude's History of England*—1529 to 1547—226 ; the parliament of 1529—parties in England, 268 ; The Roman, National, and Protestant parties, 270 ; death of Wolsey—cry for church reform, 273 ; the ecclesiastical courts, 274 ; the petition of 1530—wise reform—public opinion, 277 ; the king marries Anne Boleyn, 278 ; severe laws—perils of the Tudor dynasty, 281 ; rise of Thomas Cromwell—state of England in 1534, 283 ; severe laws at this period, 285 ; Anglo-Catholicism triumphant—persecution, 287 ; destruction of monasteries—death of Catherine, 289 ; feeling in England and Europe—the Bible, 291 ; great Catholic reaction in England, 293 ; the Pilgrimage of Grace—attitude of foreign powers, 295 ; the Act of Supremacy—Friar Forest, 297 ; Iconoclasm of 1539-40—299 ; statute of the Six Articles—Erastianism, 303 ; Cromwell and the Anglo-Catholic party, 305 ; Anglo-Catholicism triumphant—fall of Cromwell, 307 ; close of Henry's reign—death of Henry VIII., 311 ; great merits of Mr. Froude's work, 313.

*The Vatican Greek Testament*.—Description of the MS., 317 ; errors of the printed edition, 319 ; remarkable readings of the MS., 321 ; blunders of the copyist, 323 ; unsettled state of the text of the Greek Testament, 325 ; sources of the received text, 327 ; present state of controversy concerning the received text, 329 ; mutilation of the text by Tischendorf and Tregelles, 331.

*Kalendars and Old Almanacs*.—Pictorial illustrations of the mediæval kalendars, 335 ; black Friday—ancient weather prognostics, 337 ; ancient dietetics—old French almanacs, 339 ; *Le Grand Compost, et Calendrier des Bergers*, 341 ; prognostications of the planets—their influence, 343 ; political almanacs, 360.

*Wycliffe—his Biographers and Critics*.—Fasciculi Zizaniorum—contents—the editor, 363 ; Mr. Shirley's editorial offences, 365—367 ; catalogues of Wycliffe MSS., 369—372 ; Mr. Shirley—ignorance or what else ? 373 ; English biographies of Wycliffe, 375—378 ; Mr. Shirley and the *Quarterly Review*, 379 ; literary borrowing and literary blunders, 381 ; Wycliffe's early life—his dispute with the mendicants, 383 ; when he became doctor and professor, 385 ; Wykelewe, 'Whytecleve' of Mayfield, and the wardenship of Canterbury Hall, 387—391—421 ; proceedings against Wycliffe in 1377—Mr. Shirley's discovery about the 'poor priests,' 393 ; Wycliffe's realism—its influence, 395 ; Wycliffe's portraits, 397 ; Mr. Shirley's merits and defects, 397 ; German works on Wycliffe—Dr. Gröne-man, 399 ; Professor Lewald on the doctrine of Wycliffe, 400—402 ; Dr. Jaeger's Essay, 403—408 ; Professor Lechler on Wycliffe and the Lollards, 408, 409 ; his summary of Wycliffe's theology, 410, 411 ; Winkelmann's Latin Essay on Wycliffe, Gerson and Huss, 413—415 ; Professor Weber on the English Reformation, 416 ; Bohringer's Life of Wycliffe, 417—421 ; Mr. Herbert Cowell's Essay, 421.

*M. Comte's Religion for Atheists*.—Religion a necessity of man, 423 ; M. Comte's assumptions and fallacies, 425 ; his style, 427 ; origin of 'Positive Religion,' 429 ; M. Comte's *Grand Etre*, 431—435 ; his 'immortality,' 437 ; prayers, temples, rites, 439—441 ; speedy conversion of the world, 443 ; M. Comte's position as a philosopher, 445.

*Herodotus—Rawlinson*.—Life of Herodotus, 447 ; Plutarch and Herodotus, 449 ; his moral nature, 451 ; his candour and impartiality, 453 ; errors in physical science, 455 ; Herodotus and Ctesias, 457 ; early Greek history, 459 ; the historian then and now, 461 ; Kenrick—Wheeler—Blakesley, 463 ; cuneiform decipherment, 465 ; the Behistun inscription, 469 ; the Magian, 473 ; the religion of Persia, 477 ; Magism, 479 ; Mr. Rawlinson's translation, 481 ; Catholicity of scholarship, 485.

*Political Party since the Revolution*.—Relation of Reform Bill to weak ministers, 487 ; durability of administrations, 489 ; lengthy governments not desirable, 491 ; expediency of party, 493 ; effects of government without solidarity of cabi-

AFFAIRS, 516.

## EPILOGUE.

517—552.

## LITERATURE.

Books on the Indian Mutiny, 517—526.  
Barth's Travels, 526.  
Massey's History of England, 527.  
Hayward's Essays, 529.  
The Oxonian in Thelemarken, 531.  
Galleaga's Country Life in Piedmont, 532.  
State Papers relating to Scotland, 533.  
Diary of Narcissus Luttrell, 534.  
The Age, a Satire, by James Bailey, 535.  
Franciscan Records, 535.  
Kenrick's Roman Sepulchral Inscriptions, 535.  
Tudors and Stuarts, 535.  
Aytoun's Scottish Ballads, 536.  
White's Month in Yorkshire, 536.  
Hazlitt's Republic of Venice, 536.  
Barclay's City of the Great King, 537.  
Merivale's Roman Empire, vol. vi.  
537.  
Bayard Taylor's Northern Travel, 538.  
Drayton's Sporting Scenes, 538.  
Davies's Algiers in 1857, 538.  
French Literature, 538—540.

## ART.

National Gallery, 541.  
Memoirs of Seddon, 542.  
Labarte on Enamel Painting, 543.  
Blake's Long Vacation, 545.

## SCIENCE.

Noble on Mind in relation to the Brain,  
546.  
Animal Physiology, 546.  
Story of a Boulder, 546.  
Racey on Horse Taming, 547.

## THEOLOGY.

**Dr. Trench on the Authorized Version of the New Testament, 550--552.**  
**The Four Gospels in Syriac, 552.**  
**Ullmann's Sinlessness of Jesus, 56.**





